



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

- This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.
- A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.
- This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.
- The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.
- When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

CARNAL UNION WITH CHRIST IN THE THEOLOGY OF T. F. TORRANCE

WILLIAM DUNCAN RANKIN

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

1997



CARNAL UNION WITH CHRIST IN THE THEOLOGY OF T. F. TORRANCE

by William Duncan Rankin

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines and critiques the doctrine of carnal union with Christ in the theology of Scottish theologian Thomas Forsyth Torrance. Torrance's teaching on union with Christ in general and carnal or incarnational union with Christ in particular is unfolded within the wider context of his christocentric dogmatics and its genetic development. Extensive use is made of Torrance's unpublished Auburn and New College lectures on the subject. The teachings of Athanasius, Calvin, and Barth on union with Christ, since Torrance professes such a great debt to their influence on his own thought in this area, are also surveyed, and lines of continuity and discontinuity with Torrance's teaching are traced. I demonstrate that, although developed from a variety of historical sources and not so readily seen from his published works, a unique development of the ancient theological couplet of anhypostasia and enhypostasia exists at the heart of Torrance's christology. This couplet lies behind Torrance's understanding of the person of Christ and his union with humankind. He develops his doctrine of carnal union with Christ under these twin rubrics of anhypostasia and enhypostasia. I contend that while Torrance seeks to resolve the tension between these juxtaposed categories, it is not clear that he has adequately resolved the antithesis. Part of the tension is due to a lacuna in the anhypostatic rubric. Specifically, the abbreviated version of salvation history for carnal union with Christ that Torrance develops from the nonassumptus is less overtly trinitarian than that of its enhypostatic counterpart. I demonstrate that Torrance's doctrine of carnal union with Christ omits clear reference to the role of the Holy Spirit in this anhypostatic aspect of the incarnation, creating confusion in the minds of critics over the relevance of both the Holy Spirit and human response in Torrance's theology. This lacuna begs clarification in a theology that is otherwise known as overtly trinitarian. Furthermore, I contend that Torrance's doctrine of carnal union with Christ introduces an element of contingent necessity into the nature of the incarnation. Torrance's construction demands that God must incarnate in just this way, setting up a carnal union with Christ that includes all humankind in its universal range, because the Logos who assumes humanity is the creator: Christ is not only a man but Man. I argue this contingent necessity endangers the freedom of God and truncates the voluntary nature of Christ's person and work, as well as valid human response, in the anhypostatic rubric. Because of these potential difficulties, clarification beyond mere appeal to the other juxtaposed category of enhypostasia is required. Thus, I conclude that it is not acceptable for Torrance to leave doubt about either the significance of the Holy Spirit or human response in even one strand of his theological tapestry.

CARNAL UNION WITH CHRIST IN THE THEOLOGY OF T. F. TORRANCE

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
Carnal Union with Christ	1
Purpose of the Study	5
Justification of the Study	6
Thesis Statement	18
Overview	19
CHAPTER 1- T. F. TORRANCE ON UNION WITH CHRIST	20
Philosophical and Theological Background	21
Epistemology	21
Theological Science	27
Christocentric Dogmatics	30
The Doctrine of Christ	36
Nicene Christology	37
Chalcedonian Christology	46
Post-Chalcedonian Christology	69
Reformed Christology	87
Reconstructed Christology	117
Union with Christ	119
Carnal Union with Christ	121
Anhypostasia and Enhypostasia Revisited	128
Anhypostatic Solidarity	133
Conclusion	145
CHAPTER 2 - ATHANASIUS ON UNION WITH CHRIST	146
Selected Athanasian Themes	152
The Father-Son Relation	153
The Logos and Creation	154
Christ's Body	155
Christ's Soul	157
Christ's Human Solidarity	158
Christ's Death	159
Christ's Universal Relevance	160
Conclusion	161

CHAPTER 3 - JOHN CALVIN ON UNION WITH CHRIST	166
Background	167
Calvin's Response to Martyr	176
Mystical Communion with Christ	176
Spiritual Communion with Christ	182
Incarnational Communion with Christ	186
Calvin on Incarnational Communion	189
Calvin's Selected Works	190
Christ's Conception	219
Calviniana Secondary Literature	226
Conclusion	235
CHAPTER 4 - KARL BARTH ON UNION WITH CHRIST	236
The Mystery and Miracle of Christmas	237
The Problem of Christology	238
Very God and Very Man	239
The Miracle of Christmas	245
Reflections Upon the Mystery and Miracle	249
The Goal of Vocation	258
Homo Christianus	259
Unio Cum Christo	262
Reflections Upon Union with Christ	265
CHAPTER 5 - CRITIQUE	267
Athanasius on Union with Christ	267
Calvin on Union with Christ	270
Barth on Union with Christ	276
Torrance on Union with Christ	282
Anhypostatic Solidarity and the Holy Spirit	284
Anhypostatic Solidarity and Contingent Necessity	289
Anhypostatic Solidarity Revisited	294
Conclusion	297
CONCLUSION	298
BIBLIOGRAPHY	300
Primary Sources: T. F. Torrance	300
Books and Pamphlets	300
Articles, Reviews, Works as Editor, Interviews	301
Unpublished Auburn Lectures	305
Unpublished New College Lectures	305
Primary Sources: Other	306

Athanasius	306
John Calvin	307
Karl Barth	309
Secondary Sources	311
APPENDIX 1 - THE LIFE AND WORK OF T. F. TORRANCE	A-1
APPENDIX 2 - MATERIALS ON T. F. TORRANCE IN THE NEW COLLEGE ARCHIVES	A-5
The Faculty Minute Book	A-5
The University and New College Faculty of Divinity Handbooks	A-6
Minutes of the New College Theological Society	A-7
New College Library Lending Ledgers	A-8
APPENDIX 3 - TORRANCE'S AUBURN SEMINARY LECTURES	A-15
APPENDIX 4 - TORRANCE EARLY MANUSCRIPT COLLECTION	A-21
APPENDIX 5 - TORRANCE'S NEW COLLEGE LECTURES	A-35
APPENDIX 6 - COPY OF T. F. TORRANCE'S LETTER OF PERMISSION FOR USE OF HIS UNPUBLISHED LECTURES	A-41
APPENDIX 7 - MATERIALS ON T. F. TORRANCE IN THE KARL BARTH-ARCHIV	A-42
APPENDIX 8 - COPY OF T. F. TORRANCE'S LETTER OF PERMISSION FOR USE OF HIS CORRESPONDENCE WITH KARL BARTH ...	A-46
APPENDIX 9 - COPY OF THE KARL BARTH-ARCHIV LETTER OF PERMISSION FOR USE OF ARCHIVE MATERIALS	A-47
APPENDIX 10 - ARCHIVE FILE ON THE EDINBURGH CHRISTIAN UNION CASE	A-48
APPENDIX 11 - VERBATIM MINUTES OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY	A-49
APPENDIX 12 - PETER MARTYR VERMIGLI ON UNION WITH CHRIST	A-50
Martyr's Letters to Calvin and Beza	A-50
Natural Communion with Christ	A-51
Spiritual Communion with Christ	A-53
Mystical Communion with Christ	A-56

Martyr on Incarnational Communion	A-61
The Loci Communes	A-62
Christ's Conception	A-65
Vermigliana Secondary Literature	A-68
APPENDIX 13 - MELVILLE SCOTT AND T. F. TORRANCE:	
MORE THAN A REMARKABLE COINCIDENCE?	A-76
Who Was Melville Scott?	A-78
Athanasius on the Atonement	A-79
Parallels Between Scott and Torrance	A-82
Attitude to Athanasius	A-82
Third Christological School	A-84
No Mere External Transaction	A-85
Incarnation and Atonement	A-86
Fallen Human Nature of Christ	A-89
The Unassumed is the Unhealed	A-90
Sinlessness of Christ	A-92
Progress Through Conflict	A-94
Vicarious Humanity of Christ	A-95
Christ's Universal Humanity	A-98
Anhypostasia and Enhypostasia	A-100
The Latin Heresy	A-101
Synopsis of Parallels	A-105
The New College Connection	A-106
Scott's Degree of Influence	A-110
Conclusions	A-115

In the quotation of sources, I have duplicated all authors' emphases as found in those sources. I have at no point added marks of emphasis myself. The emphases contained herein subsist wholly in the words of the text.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This is not the dissertation I set out to write. My original interest was in Calvin's doctrine of the believer's union with Christ and its impact on Scottish theologians such as Robert Bruce of Kinnaird. But as I read T. F. Torrance's introduction to Bruce's sermons on the Lord's supper, my attention was pulled from the dark recesses of the sixteenth century into the present. Torrance's linking of prior historic contributions and theological elements under the wider themes of Christ's humanity and priesthood I found utterly fascinating and provocative.

Calvin and Torrance on union with Christ, I thought it would be, and I set my face towards New College in Edinburgh. Two supervisors later, I was challenged to narrow and deepen the theological focus of my work to Torrance on incarnational union. This advice was wise, I believe, in that it reshaped my efforts into a form more faithful to Torrance's own development and presentation.

There are a countless host of good people to whom I owe so very much in this endeavor; I regret that I can only mention a few.

First, let me not forget my New College supervisors and colleagues. Dr. Bruce L. McCormack, now of Princeton Theological Seminary, was my starting supervisor and will always hold a special place in my heart for showing real interest in my topic, teaching me the importance of genetic-historical studies in theology, and encouraging me with his friendship. To my final supervisor, Dr. Kevin J. Vanhoozer, who excels in the Socratic method, pulling the best out of the student with incisive questions on end, I give my heartfelt thanks for seeing me through the delays of academic employment and repeated illness, as well as the trauma of major surgery. And to my second reader through it all, Mr. David F. Wright, I wish to express deepest appreciation, not only for his friendship, but also for his careful comments along and along. Whatever deficiencies are present in this study are not to be charged to their accounts but only to my own.

New College alumni and students Dr. Adelia Kelso, Dr. Bruce McDonald, Mike Honeycutt, and Tim Trumper deserve a word of thanks, as does the entire New College Library staff. Dr. John L. McPake of Newtongrange Parish Church also deserves a special note of thanks for the many hours of conversation and commiseration on Scottish theology. It was delightful to have a like-minded scholar-friend with whom to make the journey through New College!

It would be a grievous oversight not to extend my deepest and warmest thanks to Professor Thomas Forsyth Torrance for his every aid and encouragement in my work. Many an hour was spent in his study over computers, memories, manuscripts, and tea! His kind hospitality and generosity have made this study much better than it would have been without them and will never be forgotten. His unpublished Auburn and New College lectures, used with his kind permission, have humbled me as I studied them: my own meager lecturing efforts pale by comparison to the intensity and

breadth of his knowledge. I do not know a higher compliment to pay than a sympathetic study of a central point in his thought that seeks to clarify and thus preserve his influential contribution to Scottish theology.

Next, let me thank my colleagues at Reformed Theological Seminary (RTS) in Jackson, Mississippi (USA). I appreciate all the Board, Administration, and Faculty have done to make this work possible. The encouragement of Mr. George Fair, Mr. Richard Ridgeway, Mr. Bob Cannada, Dr. Luder Whitlock, Dr. Allen Curry, the Rev. Steve Froehlich, Dr. Frank James, Dr. John Currid, and the Rev. Derek Thomas are especially noted. Special thanks are due to my lifelong professor and mentor Dr. Douglas F. Kelly for first introducing me to both the doctrine of union with Christ and the thought of T. F. Torrance. My lifelong friend and sometime colleague Dr. J. Ligon Duncan, III also deserves special mention for his ceaseless encouragement and theological comradeship. Daily interaction with him is deeply missed around the halls of the seminary, although it is a joy to have my family sitting under his fine ministry at First Presbyterian Church of Jackson, Mississippi (USA). A special word of thanks as well to the RTS proofreader, Nancy Whetstone, for the flood of redeeming red ink she spilt!

To my students at RTS, please accept my thanks for your patience in all the many hours devoted to this effort that kept me from serving you more faithfully. Special mention should be made of the kind help of the RTS Theology Department's Thornwell Scholars and others, who kept the department running while I was otherwise distracted: Ricky Jones, Robert Spears, Wes Baker, Ken Pierce, Steve Berry, Mark Levine, Alonzo Ramirez, Jeremy Boccabello, Eric Northway, Keith Berger, Jeff Steele, and Paul Helseth. Also, a special word of thanks to student volunteers who sacrificially aided this effort: Michael Herrin and Jeff Voorhees. For their many hours of steadfast service, my deepest thanks.

Several scholars deserve special thanks for their kindness in reading drafts or discussing key elements out of a love of theological research: Dr. Rick Gamble, Mr. Tony Lane, Dr. Richard Muller, Dr. James Barr, Dr. Brian Gerrish, the Rev. Will Traub, Dr. Eberhard Busch, Dr. Nick Needham, Dr. Paul Schaefer, Dr. Andy McGowan, and Prof. Scott Clark. Also, let me thank my former ceramics and materials science professor, Dr. W. David Kingery of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), Cambridge, MA (USA), for his Design for Discovery course, the lessons from which perhaps few others have applied to theological research!

In addition, several dear friends and institutions deserve special mention for their kind support, which helped to make our time in Scotland possible. Austin and Ethel Riley, Ronnie and Claudia Rowe, Walter and Marcia Russell, Earl and Mary Russell, Charles and Pat Rector, George and Bette Fair, Neil and Anne McTaggart, Eric and Moira Mackay, Ben Williams and Tom Plowden all sacrificed that this work might go forward. The Board and Administration of RTS came to our aid in a time of need. When our resources were again expended, the University of Edinburgh's then Student Accommodation Service provided gainful employment at the new West Mains Student Flats at King's Buildings, which saw us through. The Session and congregation of Second Presbyterian Church of Greenville, South Carolina (USA) deserve special thanks for their prayer support and provision of tuition through the Robbie Thompson Loan/Grant Fund. The Free Church of Scotland College provided

not only office space, but collegial interaction, resources, hospitality, and true fellowship for this wayward American. Two of her faculty in particular--men I count it a privilege to number as friends--deserve special mention for their constant encouragement: Professor Donald Macleod and Professor Alasdair I. MacLeod. And thanks to Barbara Linn and Ed Daigle, who, when I needed a quiet place to hide and write in Jackson, Mississippi (USA), came to my rescue. Without their encouragement, this work would not have been possible.

While in Scotland, our hearts were lost not only to the sights and sounds of that lovely land of our forefathers, but most of all to her good people. The friends who so cared for us while in Old Caledonia deserve a warm word of thanks: Neil and Anne McTaggart, Iain Mackay, Ian and May Macdonald, Dan and Barb MacDougall, Eric and Moira Mackay, Donald and Mary Macleod, Alasdair I. and Cathy MacLeod, John L. and Mary Mackay, Martin and Mags Cameron, the late Douglas Macmillan, Mary Macmillan, Alex MacDonald, Ruth Michell, Iain Gill, George and Irene Thomson, Donnie G. and Debbie MacDonald, Mark and Liz Wilson, Andrew and Janet Murchison, Donald and Mairi Forsyth, Martyn Clark, Nicola Clark, Tim and Jane Yee, Gladys Macdonald, Nigel Cameron, Karen Mackay, Fiona Christie, Donald and Elizabeth Mackay, Fergus and Dolina Macdonald, Raj and Jo Jandoo, Murdo Macleod, John Mann, Donald and Alice Matheson, Alen and Sheena McCulloch, Andy and June McGowan, John and Ellen McPake, John and Helen Murchison, Murdoch and Maurine Murchison, Cees and Hilda Oosterhuis, Bob and Annie-Mary Sinclair, Elizabeth Macleod, Alison Stewart, Betty Bell, Bob Ackroyd, Billy and Shona Macleod, Mike and Fiona Bowman, Brian and Brenda Norton, Janella Glover, Stuart and Elspeth Smith, Will and Judy Traub, Stephen Tracy, Debra Keays, and Douglas Gebbie. Special thanks to Mr. Bill Anderson, for being one of the finest teachers in all my life.

The prayers of the Lord's people also were a great encouragement. Thanks to the saints at First Presbyterian Church in Jackson, Mississippi (USA), Lebanon Presbyterian Church in Learned, Mississippi (USA), First Presbyterian Church in Aiken, SC (USA), Second Presbyterian Church in Greenville, SC (USA), and Buccleuch and Greyfriars Free Church of Scotland in Edinburgh. Special thanks to Don Breazeale and Billy Mink for all their prayers and encouragement.

A particular note of appreciation is due to the medical team at Baptist Hospital in Jackson, Mississippi (USA), which saw me through repeated hospitalizations, colon surgery, and the long road to recovery, that I might complete this project (and a few other things!). Dr. Earl Fyke, cardiologist and more, Dr. Stan Miller, gastroenterologist par excellence, and Dr. Mickey Koury, the finest surgeon with a knife and a smile under which I've ever had the occasion to sit--many hearty thanks for all your good care!

Also, let me thank my parents, Nevyn and Susan Rankin of Aiken, South Carolina (USA). You have done so much for your son, what words can he say? Your love, support, and example have shaped my life. You came to our rescue during my repeated hospital stays while trying to complete this work, and those days were precious. Thank you so very much. Now that the dissertation is finally completed, you shall see more of your grandsons!

To their grandsons--Thomas Reid Rankin II and Arthur John Rankin III--please

accept your father's love and deepest thanks for your patience as I have done more than I should have and neglected you too often. Continue to grow up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and the lost hours will be multiplied to us all ten-fold. I could not be prouder of you.

Finally, let me express my admiration and debt to my dear wife, Shirley, for the great sacrifices she has made in this effort. It has been a hard year and more, but Scotland was the delight of our souls and worth the struggles. I can never repay the debt of love I owe you. But it will be a good thing to keep trying!

INTRODUCTION

In any case, both Thomas F. Torrance's theology and the reader will be best served through striving at a faithful exposition of his theology in terms of its position, method, distinguishing features, and contribution. Robert J. Palma, "Thomas F. Torrance's Reformed Theology," Reformed Review 38 (1984): 2.

Perhaps no one since the Second World War has sounded a more energetic voice within the Scottish theological scene than Thomas Forsyth Torrance. His contribution and influence have been conspicuous, earning him a place among Scotland's most noteworthy theologians in the twentieth century.¹ This study seeks to clarify a central point in Torrance's theology: his doctrine of carnal union with Christ.

Carnal Union With Christ

The almost provocative term "carnal union" with Christ is not original with T. F. Torrance. Drawn from Scottish Divine John Craig's Catechism of 1581, it was included in the volume of Reformed catechisms edited by Torrance in 1959 under the title The School of Faith.² After introducing the salvation achieved by Christ using the munus triplex scheme, Craig presents a series of questions and answers that follows and expands on the outline of salvation history given in the Apostles' Creed. When enlarging upon Christ's conception by the Holy Spirit, Craig teaches:

¹For a brief overview of the life and work of T. F. Torrance, see Appendix 1.

²T. F. Torrance, The School of Faith: The Catechisms of the Reformed Church (London: James Clarke, 1959), 113.

- Q. *Why was He made man like unto us?*
 A. That He might die for us in our own nature.
 Q. *What follows upon His incarnation?*
 A. That life and righteousness are placed in our flesh.
 Q. *May not this life be lost, as it was in Adam?*
 A. No, for our flesh is joined personally with the Fountain of life.
 Q. *Then all men are sure of this life?*
 A. Not so, but only those who are joined with Him spiritually.
 Q. *What then does our carnal union with Christ avail for us?*
 A. Nothing, without our spiritual union with Him.³

Thus, John Craig uses this intriguing term "carnal union" for incarnational union in a volume compiled by T. F. Torrance.

In his lengthy introduction to The School of Faith--which contains one of the most succinct presentations of his own positive, christocentric theology yet in print--Torrance draws attention to Craig's "carnal union" terminology. Using it as an occasion to discuss the relationship between the Reformed doctrine of the communion of the Spirit and incarnational union in Christ, Torrance states:

Because the Communion of the Spirit is correlative to the incarnational union in Christ, we have to think of it as two-fold, in relation to the human life and work of Christ John Craig in his Catechism of 1581 spoke of this in terms of what he called 'our carnal union with Christ' and 'our spiritual union with Him' (p. 113). By 'carnal union' he referred to Christ's union with us and our union with Christ which He wrought out in His birth of the Spirit and in His human life through which He sanctifies us.⁴

In the pages that follow, Torrance distances himself from Craig's division between "carnal union" and "spiritual union," instead uniting the two by subsuming the latter under the former.⁵ Thus, in his introduction, Torrance utilizes the sixteenth-century

³Torrance, School of Faith, 113.

⁴Torrance, School of Faith, cvi.

⁵Torrance, School of Faith, cvi-cx. More will be said on this point in Chapter 1.

Scot's peculiar terminology but reconstructs its doctrinal content.⁶

Indeed, Torrance later attaches no small significance to his reconstructed formulation of Craig's carnal union with Christ:

The difference between these two views may appear very slight indeed at this point, but the implications of this difference are very far-reaching especially in the whole sphere of the life and work of the Church, in the doctrine of grace, and in our understanding of the Sacraments.⁷

Thus, though his terminology is clearly drawn from Craig, the theological substance of Torrance's thought at this important point has other origins and ramifications.

One major study of Torrance's theology highlights his use of Craig's "carnal

⁶Interestingly, John Craig's doctrine of union with Christ also appears in the 1958 Interim Report of the Church of Scotland's Special Commission on Baptism, which was presented to the General Assembly by its chairman, T. F. Torrance. Although the phrase "carnal union" is not used, it is clearly in view: "Here again Craig thinks of a two-fold union. The primary union is that which Christ has made with us when He became bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, but through the operation of the Spirit all who have faith in Christ are made flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone" ("Interim Report of the Special Commission on Baptism," Minutes of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland [May 1958], 702). The designation of union with Christ as "two-fold" and incarnational union as "primary" is not made by Craig. For Torrance's dominant role in drafting the interim reports of this commission, see Torrance's own comments in "Verbatim Minutes of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1958," Office of the Principal Clerk, Church of Scotland, 1151; and also Kang Phee Seng, "The Concept of the Vicarious Humanity of Christ in the Theology of Thomas Forsyth Torrance" (Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1983), 425. All future citations of this work by Kang Phee Seng will be cited as Kang. For a recent and more restrained appraisal of this dominance, see John L. McPake, "H. R. Mackintosh, T. F. Torrance and the Reception of the Theology of Karl Barth in Scotland - With Particular Reference to the Concept of the Self-Revelation of God," (Ph.D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 1994), 87. For a very recent but brief example of this line of analysis of Craig by Torrance, see T. F. Torrance, Scottish Theology: From John Knox to John McLeod Campbell (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1996), 50-53.

⁷Torrance, School of Faith, cvii-cviii.

union" and considers it briefly as a separate locus.⁸ However, more cogent questions are raised by the study under that heading than are answered. Thus, while a full treatment of the dogmatic issues involved is not given, carnal union is seen to be an important theological topic in the thought of T. F. Torrance.

Craig's "carnal union" language is used by Torrance only once outside his lengthy introduction to The School of Faith, but the concept demarcated by this striking term--the incarnation's significance for the doctrine of union with Christ--is a recurrent theme in Torrance's theology.⁹ In addition, the provocative terminology is now beginning to appear in the works of other scholars, apparently due to Torrance's

⁸M. B. Agnew, "The Concept of Sacrifice in the Eucharistic Theology of Donald M. Baillie, Thomas F. Torrance, and Jean-Jacques Von Allmen" (Ph.D. diss., Catholic University of America, 1972), 213-215.

⁹Very recently, however, Torrance has once again described Craig's doctrine of union with Christ, using the early Scottish theologian's term "carnal union," but without then taking it to describe his own positive, christocentric theology (see Torrance, Scottish Theology, 51-52). Torrance uses various terms in his wider corpus to demarcate this concept--especially "incarnational union," more generally "union with Christ," and even "ontological union with Christ." For example, see T. F. Torrance, "The Atonement and Oneness of the Church," Scottish Journal of Theology 7 (1954): 254; T. F. Torrance, "The Place of the Humanity of Christ in the Sacramental Life of the Church," Church Service Society Annual 26 (1956): 6-9; T. F. Torrance, "Introduction" to The Mystery of the Lord's Supper: Sermons on the Sacrament Preached in the Kirk of Edinburgh by Robert Bruce in A. D. 1589 by Robert Bruce, trans. and ed. T. F. Torrance (London: James Clarke, 1958), 35; T. F. Torrance, Theology in Reconstruction (London: SCM Press, 1965), 184-186; T. F. Torrance, God and Rationality (London: Oxford University Press, 1971), 64-65; T. F. Torrance, The Mediation of Christ (Exeter: Paternoster Press, first edition, 1983), 75-82; and more recently, T. F. Torrance, The Christian Doctrine of God, One Being Three Persons (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1996), 160-161. Thus, this key concept of carnal or incarnational union with Christ appears through the decades in Torrance's writings. Torrance does at times use the simple adjective "carnal" in a different pejorative sense; for example, see T. F. Torrance, When Christ Comes and Comes Again (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1957), 73 and 75.

influence.¹⁰ This study seeks to clarify Torrance's doctrine of carnal or incarnational union, especially in its connection with his fuller doctrine of union with Christ.

Purpose of the Study

What, then, is Torrance's doctrine of carnal union with Christ, and what is its real historical and theological context in his thinking? To resolve these questions, in this study I shall seek to do the following:

1. Unfold and clarify Torrance's doctrine of carnal union with Christ in the wider context of his christocentric dogmatics. Special attention will be paid to the genetic development of this doctrine in his own thinking, as well as to the key insights on which it is based.
2. Examine the historical background to Torrance's doctrine of carnal union with Christ in the writings of at least three theologians who are quite important to his thinking: Athanasius, Calvin, and Barth.
3. Critique Torrance's doctrine of carnal union with Christ both internally and externally.

¹⁰For example, Robert Redman identifies "carnal union" as a distinctive of Knoxian Calvinism, a point he apparently deduced from Charles Bell's study of Scottish theology and Torrance's introduction to The School of Faith. See Robert R. Redman, "The Christ of the Cross: The Person and Work of Jesus Christ in the Theology of H. R. Mckintosh," (Ph.D. diss., University of Erlangen, 1989 [revised 1992]), 145-146; and M. Charles Bell, Calvin and Scottish Theology: The Doctrine of Assurance (Edinburgh: Handsel Press, 1985), 65, n. 74. More recently, Redman identifies "carnal union" as a major emphasis of early Scottish Reformed theology. Robert R. Redman, Jr., "Participatio Christi: H. R. Mackintosh's Theology of the Unio Mystica," Scottish Journal of Theology 49 (1996): 202-203.

Justification of the Study

Why is this study important? What justifies this study as being significant?

1. Torrance's doctrine of carnal union with Christ is significant because it is central to his christology and important for his entire dogmatic program, as this study will show. Carnal union with Christ is closely related to a number of other important themes in Torrance's christology: the fallen humanity of Christ, the unassumed is the unhealed, and the vicarious humanity of Christ, to name only a few. This study is significant because it treats a topic integral to Torrance's wider christology. The carnal union with Christ doctrine also has important implications for Torrance's anthropology, soteriology, and ecclesiology. This study of carnal union with Christ is significant because it helps clarify Torrance's wider positive theology.

2. Previous studies of Torrance's positive theology have not addressed his doctrine of carnal union with Christ in detail. Most studies have concentrated on his work in science and theological method, rarely mentioning incarnational union with Christ.¹¹ Three previous studies have explored Torrance's doctrine of the knowledge

¹¹To date, at least a dozen studies of Torrance on science and theological method have been made: B. J. A. Gray, "Theology as Science: An Examination of the Theological Methodology of Thomas F. Torrance" (S.Th.D. diss., Katholieke Universiteit, Louvain, 1975); W. Lumley, "Analogy in a Theological Setting" (Ph.D. diss., Queens University, Belfast, 1977); D. K. Harink, "Theology as Science: An Exposition and Evaluation of the Thought of Thomas Forsyth Torrance" (Master of Christian Studies thesis, Regent College, Vancouver, Canada, 1979); D. L. Sansom, "Scientific Theology: An Examination of the Methodology of Thomas Forsyth Torrance" (Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1981); N. J. Coates, "Some Implications of M. Polanyi's Concept of Personal Knowledge for Theological Method, with Special Reference to T. F. Torrance" (M.A. thesis, University of Wales, 1982); B. H. Meardon, "A Study of Space, Time and Incarnation in the Work of T. F. Torrance" (M.Phil. thesis, Oak Hill College, 1984); J. B. Miller, "Beyond Dualism: Cosmological Issues for Christian Theology in a Post-Modern, Post-Critical Cultural Context" (Ph.D. diss., Marquette University, 1986); D. A.

of God and related issues.¹² Two previous studies have investigated Torrance on the sacraments, touching somewhat on union with Christ.¹³ Only four studies to date have

Trook, "The Unified Christocentric Field: Toward a Time-Eternity Relativity Model for Theological Hermeneutics in the Onto-Relational Theology of Thomas F. Torrance" (Ph.D. diss., Drew University, 1986); W. Achtner, "Physik, Mystik und Christentum: Eine Darstellung und Diskussion der natürlichen Theologie bei T. F. Torrance" (Ph.D. diss., University of Heidelberg, 1990); K. A. Richardson, "Trinitarian Reality: The Interrelation of Uncreated and Created Being in the Thought of Thomas Forsyth Torrance" (Ph.D. diss., University of Basel, 1991); E. M. Colyer, "The Nature of Doctrine in the Theology of T. F. Torrance" (Ph.D. diss., Boston College, 1992); R. Kirby, "The Theological Definition of Cosmic Disorder In the Writings of Thomas Forsyth Torrance" (Ph.D. diss., University of London, 1992); Wong Wing Hong, "An Appraisal of the Interpretation of Einsteinian Physics in T. F. Torrance's Scientific Theology" (Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1994); Hing Kau Yeung, "Being and Knowing: An Examination of T. F. Torrance's Christological Science" (Ph.D. diss., University of London, 1994). Of these, Trook moves more broadly and substantially beyond Torrance's scientific theological method onto the ground of his positive theology than any other study, but the value of his treatment is somewhat diminished by its idiosyncratic character, on which more will be said later. On a more limited basis, Kirby also moves between Torrance's work on science and his positive theology--particularly between Torrance's treatment of entropy and evil--touching on occasion themes related to carnal union (see Kirby, 246-249). Only one of these studies has been published on a limited basis: K. A. Richardson, Trinitarian Reality: The Interrelation of Uncreated and Created Being in the Thought of Thomas Forsyth Torrance (Wake Forrest, NC: The Ethne Group, 1993). All future citations of Richardson's work will be made from this published edition. For a summary of Torrance's contributions in science and theological methodology, see Daniel W. Hardy, "Thomas F. Torrance" in The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology in the Twentieth Century, vol. 1, ed. David F. Ford (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989), 71-91.

¹²See R. J. Newell, "Participatory Knowledge: Theology as Art and Science in C. S. Lewis and T. F. Torrance" (Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1983); C. B. Kruger, "Participation in the Self-Knowledge of God: The Nature and Means of our Knowledge of God in the Theology of T. F. Torrance" (Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1989); and McPake. This fine work by McPake covers the entrance of Barth's concept of the knowledge of God onto the Scottish theological scene with historical and theological sensitivity and is soon to be published. McPake does point out in passing Torrance's doctrine of carnal union, not in name but in concept (McPake, 303-304).

¹³See Agnew; and R. J. Stamps, "'The Sacrament of the Word Made Flesh': The Eucharistic Theology of Thomas F. Torrance" (Ph.D. diss., University of Nottingham

examined Torrance's christology.¹⁴

Of the works examining Torrance's christology, Guthridge's study treats his doctrines of christological revelation and reconciliation far too broadly to peruse union with Christ in much detail.¹⁵ The value of Guthridge's study lies in its relating Torrance's early published works with his unpublished New College Lectures, and its boldness in attempting to derive Torrance's anthropology.¹⁶

Both Kang and Kettler are interested in Torrance's doctrine of the vicarious humanity of Christ, which brings them into much closer contact with our topic.

and the Council for National Academic Awards, U.K., 1986). Agnew's interest in Roman Catholic eucharistic theology dominates her treatment, but she does probe briefly the issue of carnal union (Agnew, 213-215). Stamps rebuts Agnew's general bias, but without knowledge of Torrance's unpublished lectures does not explore Torrance's positive, systematic thinking in enough detail to explain the tensions he finds. He does, however, draw attention to incarnational union in Torrance's theology (see Stamps, 163, 175). Neither work is published.

¹⁴See I. N. Guthridge, "Revelation and Reconciliation in Christ: The Christology of T. F. Torrance" (Ph.D. diss., Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, Rome, 1967); Kang; C. D. Kettler, "The Vicarious Humanity of Christ and the Reality of Salvation" (Ph.D. diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 1986); and L. G. Robertson, "The Relationship Between Incarnation and Atonement in the Theology of T. F. Torrance" (M.Th. thesis, Australian College of Theology, 1990). A short, edited excerpt from chapter 4 of Guthridge's dissertation was published under his Latinized name: Joannes Guthridge, The Christology of T. F. Torrance: Revelation and Reconciliation in Christ (Melbourne: Society of St. Paul, 1967). All future citations to Guthridge will be to his unpublished dissertation. Kettler's dissertation was slightly revised and published as C. D. Kettler, The Vicarious Humanity of Christ (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1991). For a summary of Torrance's positive theology, as well as his theological method, see Robert J. Palma, "Thomas F. Torrance's Reformed Theology," Reformed Review 38 (1984): 2-46.

¹⁵The topic of Christ's incarnational union and solidarity with man is directly addressed for only three significant pages. See Guthridge, 253-255.

¹⁶Guthridge, 90-115. Unfortunately, no other study of T. F. Torrance makes use of Guthridge's full, fine unpublished study.

Neither study, however, approaches being a detailed study of Torrance's doctrine of union with Christ. On the one hand, while Kang does treat the humanity of Christ for one full chapter, his interests do not lie in probing and engaging Torrance's teachings on union with Christ.¹⁷

On the other hand, while Kettler does place Torrance's vicarious humanity of Christ in a wider historical context, the intent of his study is more to develop additional positive theology from this theme.¹⁸ In so doing, however, Kettler devotes only one chapter to Torrance and spends it displaying the relevance of his concept of the vicarious humanity of Christ for nearly a dozen different theological loci.¹⁹ Thus, Kettler gives what he describes as a "rather hurried survey of T. F. Torrance's thoughts on the vicarious humanity of Christ and salvation"--hardly a careful treatment of Torrance's doctrine of carnal union with Christ.²⁰

¹⁷Kang, "Chapter 5: The Full Humanity of Christ," 245-338. The second section of this chapter is most relevant for our topic, discussing the incarnation and hypostatic union (Kang, 249-260). However, analysis of Torrance's doctrine of incarnational union with Christ is wholly absent from this chapter, as well as the wider dissertation. As a locus, incarnational union is only mentioned in this relevant section twice (Kang, 247, 314). More on Kang's study shall be said below.

¹⁸Kettler devotes chapters to the related thought of McLeod Campbell, Barth, Cobb, Boff, Moltmann, Pannenberg, Hick, and Küng. In the introductory section of his work, Kettler declares: "Our proposal is that the teaching on the humanity of God in the thought of Karl Barth and Eberhard Jüngel provides both a critique of anthropocentric soteriologies, and a positive alternative, but only as it is fulfilled in the doctrine of the vicarious humanity of Christ as particularly elaborated by T. F. Torrance" (Kettler, 13). However, only one thirty-three page chapter of the 327-page book is on Torrance. The balance is historical treatment and Kettler's own positive development of the vicarious humanity theme.

¹⁹Kettler, 121-154.

²⁰Kettler, 150. Oddly, Kettler is unaware of Kang's significant work on vicarious humanity, which was completed in 1983, even though one of his examiners and

In examining the relationship between incarnation and atonement in Torrance's theology, Robertson's study perhaps comes closer to our topic than does any other on Torrance's christology.²¹ While Robertson is intent on moving beyond a mere description of Torrance's position, his short study raises more questions than it is able to address adequately.²²

Trook's dissertation is a quest to discover a theological unified field theory which will explain God and creation. He locates this illusive prize in "the definitive nucleus" of Torrance's theology--the interrelation between time and eternity.²³ While Trook's main attention centers on Torrance's work on science, he does develop the lines of continuity between Torrance's work on Christ and salvation, in addition to his work on Christ and creation. For example, in the space of some four pages, Trook describes "the anthropological homooousion" or Christ's solidarity with humankind.²⁴ However, once identified, he more assumes than probes this relation and is apparently not aware more specifically of carnal union. Trook's overarching concern is to chart the scientific and creational facets of Torrance's work and their implications through

mentors--J. B. Torrance--was Kang's supervisor. This oversight is true both for Kettler's dissertation (completed in 1986) and his book (published in 1991).

²¹Robertson does at one point in his discussion probe the solidarity between Christ and mankind. See Robertson, 106-110.

²²Unfortunately, the treatment suffers from inadequate documentation and a general vagueness and brevity, perhaps because Robertson completed the work on his master's thesis while serving as a language instructor in China, where there was no adequate library on the topic.

²³Trook, xii and 7.

²⁴Trook, 59-63.

the unified field theory he develops.²⁵

The only study to specifically treat the topic of carnal union with Christ in the theology of T. F. Torrance is Mary Barbara Agnew's study of eucharistic sacrifice themes. Her study identifies "carnal union" as a noteworthy locus in Torrance's theology, doubtless because of its linguistic connotations for her topic.²⁶ Agnew is especially intrigued by the way Torrance combines the themes of substitution and union when discussing the relation between Christ and humankind. While her work raises a number of important questions on Torrance's doctrine of union with Christ, it suffers from its limited scope.²⁷ Agnew can only then conclude:

Thus, we cannot be entirely satisfied that Torrance has fully resolved the question of man's union with Christ; is it one union, or one objective union gradually actualized subjectively?²⁸

The present study is significant because, building on past studies, it examines Torrance's carnal union with Christ in detail for the first time.

3. A surprising number of previous studies of Torrance's postive theology satisfy themselves with descriptive and doxological appraisals of his thought, failing to engage his theology historically and critically, which is an invariable prerequisite to full,

²⁵In his section titled "Master Matrix of Fluid Axioms," Trook identifies "the master analogical matrix, which serves as the disclosure model for all Torrancian relation" (Trook, 309). Trook summarizes his findings in a series of charts outlining this web of relationships between Christ, covenant, and creation. See Trook, 309, 311-313, 317, and 334.

²⁶Agnew, 212-213.

²⁷Agnew only examines Torrance's School of Faith on the theme of carnal union with Christ. See Agnew, 213-215.

²⁸Agnew, 215. Agnew's treatment of carnal union in Torrance's theology is limited to this short three-page section in her Catholic University of America dissertation.

meaningful appreciation.

Several studies devote three or four hundred pages to a description of one aspect or another of Torrance's thought, giving little critical reflection. Kang's treatment of Christ's vicarious humanity is perhaps the most obvious example of this tendency. With boundless detail and precision, he catalogues and summarizes Torrance on Christ's divinity and humanity, such as we have it in the published record. But Kang clearly struggles to utter even a word or two of critique.²⁹ To a lesser degree, Kruger's study suffers from the same defect.³⁰

Trook's study follows this same pattern, but is at the same time much more visionary. In his quest for a theological unified field theory, Trook discovers that "the implications of Torrance's thought are revolutionary but underdeveloped and virtually ignored."³¹ Thus, he pursues his quest by "exposing, analyzing and extending the

²⁹Kang only notes that Torrance's English is difficult to read and that Torrance does not give enough biblical exegesis or societal application. On the other hand, Kang develops separate sections praising Torrance for having developed the ideal christocentric, trinitarian, evangelical, authentically human, catholic, Reformed, ecumenical, and doxological theology (see Kang, 431-467). In passing, McPake also recognizes this defect in Kang's study: "For a summary and exposition of Torrance, without any acknowledgement of the basic issues raised . . . see Kang . . ." (McPake, 92, n. 113).

³⁰On general aspects of Torrance's work, Kruger is able to raise questions at a number of points: Torrance's cogency, precision, historical accuracy, place for the Holy Spirit, and the like. However, when dealing with his topic, Kruger quietly assumes that Torrance's approach is definitive and on that basis appears satisfied to limit himself mainly to the descriptive (see Kruger, 311-334). In his study of the entrance of Barth's concept of the self-revelation of God onto the Scottish scene, which in no small measure deals with Torrance, McPake is aware of, but does not feel the need to respond to, Kruger's previous work, apparently because it does not move far beyond the descriptive. See McPake.

³¹Trook, 4-5.

central dynamic component of his revolution: time, eternity and their interrelation"³² Sadly, Trook describes this important aspect of Torrance's thought with elaborate, convoluted jargon that at times borders on the unintelligible.³³ What is clear, however, is that Trook considers his topic so absolutely definitive that he can do little more than expansively describe it with hagiographic fervor.³⁴

Given Torrance's viscous writing style and the lack of a published systematic treatment of his positive theology, these descriptive approaches may well have their place.³⁵ However, by not moving significantly beyond the descriptive, they do not go far in clarifying and, thus, preserving Torrance's place in the history of theology. This study will seek to do so.

³²Trook, 7.

³³The odd mixture of theological and especially scientific tags employed by Trook to describe Torrance and the possible implications of his thought even left this alumnus of MIT at times wanting. For example, see Trook's "magnetic field model for the unity of the Advents" (Trook, 203).

³⁴The final note on which Trook's work ends perhaps best typifies the whole: "Nevertheless, at this point in time, provisional as it is, we are inclined to suggest, though Abraham and Einstein died without reaching their respective envisioned goals, with Thomas F. Torrance we have a theological John the Baptist, harbinger of the Messianic age of theological revolution. To the extent that we have succeeded in calling attention to this nearly solitary voice crying in the wilderness, we shall be satisfied that our labor has not been in vain. **FOR FROM HIM AND TO HIM AND THROUGH HIM ARE ALL THINGS. TO HIM BE GLORY FOR EVER. AMEN**" (Trook, 394-395). Note Trook gives no references for his block capital last sentences. Clearly, much personally is at stake for Trook in this investigation, given his obsession "to establish my personal kinetic relationship to Professor Torrance . . ." (Trook, 41). Trook declares Torrance to be "the definitive judge" of the merit of his study, a debatable point in itself (Trook, 48).

³⁵Kang's study is certainly an aid to any student of Torrance's christology. Kruger's is the same on Torrance's doctrine of the knowledge of God, having perhaps broader usefulness. Trook's study is quite helpful at points and even insightful at others. Thus, in this study, I will build on the contributions of these more descriptive works.

This study overcomes the deficiencies of some past studies of Torrance's positive theology by moving beyond the descriptive to a historical and critical appreciation of a key concept in Torrance's theology. Greater sensitivity to these factors is needed to clarify the development of Torrance's doctrine and to isolate his unique contributions.

4. A clearer and more critical understanding of carnal union with Christ clarifies Torrance's wider theology, including an unresolved dispute between Thomas Smail and Christian D. Kettler over the role of the Holy Spirit and human response in the theology of T. F. Torrance.³⁶ This study is significant because it clarifies and resolves this current dispute.

5. If the doctrine of carnal union with Christ lies at the heart of Torrance's christology, then it is a fitting test case in which to trace the lines of continuity and discontinuity between Torrance and several key historic sources from which he draws:

³⁶Several critics charge Torrance with diminishing the role of the Holy Spirit and/or human response. See Thomas Smail, The Giving Gift: The Holy Spirit in Person (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1988), 109-112; R. J. Stamps, 411-425; Kirby, 221; and James Quinn, Review of Theology in Reconstruction by T. F. Torrance, in Theological Studies 28 (1967): 388-390. Against the criticism of Smail in particular, C. D. Kettler defends Torrance (see C. D. Kettler, The Vicarious Humanity of Christ, 139-142). Kettler's work is a published version of his Fuller Seminary dissertation, and this polemic section against Smail's allegation is the major addition to the revised, published volume. All future citations of Smail's work will be from the published volume. The dispute between Smail and Kettler has been noted by several scholars: John C. Koedyker, Review of The Vicarious Humanity of Christ and the Reality of Salvation by C. D. Kettler, in Reformed Review 45 (1992): 253-254; and Colyer, 292-293, n. 58. Perhaps even Torrance himself has noted this dispute. In the Foreword to the second edition of his book The Mediation of Christ, he mentions unnamed critics and goes out of his way to stress both the Holy Spirit and human response. See T. F. Torrance, The Mediation of Christ (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1992), xii.

Athanasius, Calvin, and Barth.³⁷ Torrance cites these three major theologians repeatedly, making them significant to any study of his theology.³⁸

Other theologians might also be suggested who have profoundly influenced the theology of T. F. Torrance, and I will not overlook their formative influence on

³⁷While a host of sources are evident in almost any of Torrance's major writings, his principal debt to Athanasius, Calvin, and Barth is almost self-evident. These are the three theologians on which Torrance has published the most substantial secondary treatments. On Athanasius, Torrance's secondary material is spread over several volumes in which Athanasius predominates: T. F. Torrance, The Trinitarian Faith: The Evangelical Theology of the Ancient Catholic Church (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988); T. F. Torrance, Divine Meaning: Studies in Patristic Hermeneutics (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1995); and Torrance, Christian Doctrine of God. On Calvin, see T. F. Torrance, Calvin's Doctrine of Man (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949); and T. F. Torrance, The Hermeneutics of John Calvin (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1988). On Barth, see T. F. Torrance, Karl Barth: An Introduction to His Early Theology, 1910-1931 (London: SCM Press, 1962); and T. F. Torrance, Karl Barth, Biblical and Evangelical Theologian (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1990). When queried about his greatest lifetime achievements, Torrance himself singles out these three theologians and his relationship to them (Michael Bowman, Roundtable: Conversations with European Theologians [Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1990], 117). Torrance considers Athanasius his favorite theologian and cites the Alexandrian more often than any other, ancient or modern (T. F. Torrance, Christ's Words [Jedburgh: Unity Press, 1980], 4). An icon of St. Athanasius hangs in Torrance's study, a copy of which was included in his book Trinitarian Faith (Kruger, 76-77). More popularly, R. D. Kernohan also recognizes the importance of this triad of theologians on Torrance's life work (see R. D. Kernohan, "Tom Torrance: The Man and the Reputation," Life and Work [May 1976]: 15). More importantly for our study, a previous study that focuses on Christ's humanity in Torrance's theology has cited these three theologians as being the major figures he follows in this area (see Kang, 343).

³⁸It is not necessary to catalogue the numerous occasions on which Torrance invokes this triad of theologians. McPake has persuasively argued that Athanasius, Calvin, and Barth play a unique role in Torrance's version of the history of theology, which in turn impinges on his whole theological agenda (see McPake, 11-23). These three "provide the major points of continuity, in respect of the concept of self-revelation" (McPake, 19), which Torrance sees as "the irreducible minimum of any claim to be in continuity with the catholic Christian faith . . ." (McPake, 11).

Torrance's doctrine of union with Christ.³⁹ In general, however, the three theologians chosen for this study stand above the herd.

This study is significant because it clarifies Torrance's relationship at an important point in his theology to at least three important influences on his thinking: Athanasius, Calvin, and Barth.

6. Most previous studies overlook a wealth of material available for treatment. Our study includes a number of new and unique materials.

This is the first study to plunder the interesting materials on Torrance in the New College Archives.⁴⁰ This is the first study to peruse Torrance's 1938-1939 unpublished Auburn Seminary Lectures.⁴¹ Few have used Torrance's pre-1966 unpublished New College Lectures.⁴² This study uses both sets of unpublished lectures extensively, with Torrance's kind written permission.⁴³ Nor has any other study consulted the unpublished correspondence between Torrance and Barth, as well as

³⁹For example, in his succinct critique of Torrance's christology, Donald Macleod boldly asserts: "T. F. Torrance was a student of H. R. Mackintosh but seems to have imbibed little of his mentor's interest in *kenosis*. The real influences on his thought have been McLeod Campbell, Edward Irving and Karl Barth. The Fathers and Reformers are read through the eyes of these later thinkers" (D. Macleod, "Christology," Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993], 174). The impact of Irenaeus, Cyril of Alexandria, the Cappadocians, Mackintosh, Campbell, Irving, and others on Torrance's thinking will not be ignored in our study; rather, their influence will be partly clarified and established.

⁴⁰See Appendix 2.

⁴¹See Appendix 3 and Appendix 4.

⁴²See Appendix 5.

⁴³See Appendix 6.

other interesting materials, at the Karl Barth-Archiv in Basel, Switzerland.⁴⁴ No other study has consulted the archive file on the Edinburgh University Christian Union case, an ecumenical experiment in which Torrance was involved.⁴⁵ This study also draws upon Torrance's speeches recorded in the Verbatim Minutes of the Church of Scotland General Assembly.⁴⁶

Merely coming to grips with Torrance's published materials was a challenge for a number of previous studies. I shall interact not only with the published material, but with this important wider range of materials as well, especially the unpublished lectures and archival materials.

7. Thomas Forsyth Torrance is significant. His influence on the Scottish theological scene has been conspicuous, as can be seen in Appendix 1. And, at the end of the day, no matter how one judges Torrance's theology, it is noteworthy because he still believes in doing positive theology in an age of waning interest in such endeavors.⁴⁷ This study is significant because T. F. Torrance and his theology are significant.

⁴⁴See Appendix 7, Appendix 8, and Appendix 9.

⁴⁵See Appendix 10.

⁴⁶See Appendix 11.

⁴⁷Positive theology is not as popular as it once was, making Torrance's interest in the subject all the more noteworthy and important in its own right. On this general trend, see B. L. Hebblethwaite, The Problems of Theology (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 1. For the continuing need for positive theology, see Wolfhart Pannenberg, An Introduction to Systematic Theology (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 13-16.

Thesis Statement

What, then, is the thesis statement of this study? In this study, I shall argue the following:

While T. F. Torrance's doctrine of carnal union with Christ is uniquely developed using a variety of historic sources, it rests on an unresolved tension between two accounts of the incarnation--one conceived as an anhypostatic solidarity, another conceived as an enhypostatic relation--at the heart of his christology, which begs clarification with regard to the relevance of the Holy Spirit and human response, and also introduces an element of contingent necessity into the nature of the incarnation.

This argument shall be developed throughout the chapters of this dissertation and especially in the critique offered in Chapter 5.

Overview

In Chapter 1, I shall lay out Torrance's doctrine of union with Christ clearly and sympathetically, giving special attention to its relation to the incarnation and carnal union. Special attention will be given to the genetic-historical development of that doctrine in his thinking, especially as indicated in his unpublished lectures. In Chapter 2, I shall investigate the doctrine of union with Christ as it is found in the writings of Athanasius, not overlooking key secondary treatments that might have influenced Torrance's understanding of this church father. In Chapter 3, I shall unfold the doctrine of union with Christ in Calvin, especially in light of important primary material often overlooked in other studies. In Chapter 4, I shall discuss Karl Barth's doctrine of union with Christ, giving close attention to his understanding of the incarnation and humanity of Christ in relation to that doctrine. In Chapter 5, I shall, in light of the previous historical and dogmatic treatments, examine and critique Torrance's doctrine of carnal union with Christ both internally and externally. In the Conclusion, I shall

close, reflecting upon the progress made in our study.

CHAPTER 1

T. F. TORRANCE ON UNION WITH CHRIST

Apart from Christ's incarnational union with us and our union with Christ on that ontological basis, justification degenerates into only an empty moral relation. T. F. Torrance. God and Rationality, 65.

Is the spiritual union another union, a union in addition to our carnal union with Christ, or is it a sharing in the one and only union between God and man wrought out in Jesus Christ? That is a very important question, for if the spiritual union is an additional union, then our salvation depends not only on the finished work of Christ but upon something else as well which has later to be added on to it before it is real for us. . . . As against that grave aberration it must be insisted that there is only one union with Christ, that which He has wrought out with us in His birth and life and death and resurrection and in which He gives us to share through the gift of His Spirit. The difference between these two views may appear very slight indeed at this point, but the implications of this difference are very far-reaching especially in the whole sphere of the life and work of the Church, in the doctrine of grace, and in our understanding of the Sacraments. T. F. Torrance, The School of Faith, cvii-cviii.

In this first chapter, I will set out T. F. Torrance's doctrine of union with Christ in its broader theological context. First, the philosophical and theological background integral to its proper understanding will be surveyed. Then, especially drawing upon Torrance's unpublished lectures, his christology will be examined as the immediate framework in which his doctrine of union with Christ arises. Next, a clear picture will be presented of Torrance's doctrine of union with Christ in its several forms and facets, giving particular attention to carnal union. Finally, the implications of this doctrine drawn by Torrance will be highlighted.

At every step, sensitivity to historical context and development will be maintained. Our concern here is not critical engagement, but a faithful and

appreciative survey of Torrance's thought on the doctrine of union with Christ, giving careful attention to the role he assigns the theme of carnal union in his overall treatment.

Philosophical and Theological Background

Because Torrance's approach to christology in general and union with Christ in particular bears the definite marks of his epistemology, it is pertinent first to appreciate the epistemological and theological background to his thought. Thus, a brief survey of these will now be given.

Epistemology

According to T. F. Torrance, epistemology is best considered retrospectively, as part of the underlying background of our thought, not only in daily life but also in theological writing.¹ However, in his Mediation of Christ--a work which T.A. Smail fittingly calls "quintessential Torrance"--the Edinburgh theologian himself begins with

¹"It is scientifically false to begin with epistemology" (T. F. Torrance, Theological Science [London: Oxford University Press, 1969], 10). Such an attitude also reflects Torrance's own personal development in this area: he did not begin his career consumed by questions of general epistemology, but rather, interested in revelation, christology, and theological method, especially in light of the contributions of Karl Barth. Torrance's wider interest in general epistemology, which sprang from his study of the relationship between his first love--theology--and the general sciences, is a later development. McPake dates this transition to the period between 1959 and 1969, "when the content of, Theological Science, was being forged" (McPake, 367). McPake's independent dating fits with the previous observations of Hendrikus Berkhof, based on the dates of the articles that make up Theology in Reconstruction, that Torrance's interests shifted to questions of the relationship between faith and science sometime between 1956 and 1963. See H. Berkhof, Review of Theology in Reconstruction by T. F. Torrance, in Nederland Theologisch Tijdschrift 20 (1966): 298.

epistemology.² Torrance also displays this same epistemological priority in his unpublished New College lectures, including in his introductory section a lecture titled "Scientific Dogmatics," which deals with epistemology, before he begins to unfold his christology.³ Thus, for the sake of clarity, we will follow Torrance's own example and give a brief, preliminary explanation of Torrance's epistemology.⁴

Early in The Ground and Grammar of Theology, Torrance articulates his fundamental epistemological principle:

The fundamental principle that I have been concerned with is a simple one, but its implications are deep and far-reaching when worked out consistently over the whole range of human knowledge. We know things in accordance with their natures, or what they are in themselves; and so we let the nature of what we know determine for us the content and form of our knowledge.⁵

This fundamental principle is applied by Torrance to science, broadly conceived.⁶

²On the first edition of Torrance's The Mediation of Christ, Smail remarks: "This book, developed from the author's 1982 Didsbury Lectures in Manchester, is quintessential Torrance. . . . For many students indeed it would be an excellent introduction to the Torrance corpus" (T. A. Smail, Review of T. F. Torrance's The Mediation of Christ, in Scottish Journal of Theology 38 [1985]: 241-244). The second edition includes a new foreword and a new final chapter entitled "The Atonement and the Trinity." All future citations will be from this second edition. Both editions of Torrance's The Mediation of Christ begin with a treatment of epistemology in chapter 1. See T. F. Torrance, The Mediation of Christ, 1-6.

³T. F. Torrance, "Scientific Dogmatics," New College Lectures, personal collection of T. F. Torrance.

⁴In these two opening sections, I am following the outline of presentation of this background given by Torrance himself in the opening section of the first chapter of his Mediation of Christ. See Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 1-9.

⁵T. F. Torrance, The Ground and Grammar of Theology (Belfast: Christian Journals, 1980), 8.

⁶T. F. Torrance, Theological Science (London: Oxford University Press, 1969), viii. Science was not always so fondly viewed by Torrance, who early in his career charged that it forces "our knowledge into a false coherence" and works "upon a false abstraction" (T. F. Torrance, The Modern Theological Debate [London: Theological

Torrance is firmly planted in the realist camp of philosophy and professes great debt to the influence of Michael Polanyi in this area.⁷

Students' Prayer Union of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions, 1941], 16, 20-21). This sentiment was repeated by Torrance before the New College Theological Society in his Honorary Presidential Address on 10 November 1941: "The knowledge that we gain in faith is not something that can be made scientific. Science is the activity of the autonomous reason in a fallen world, a world in which the relation to God is regarded as deistic and characterized by causal necessity" (T. F. Torrance, "The Place and Function of Reason in Christian Theology," Evangelical Quarterly 14 [1942]: 28). Later in life, however, Torrance's attitude shifted. His work on science grew with the publication of Theological Science in 1969 and blossomed in the 1980's with the publication of such works as T. F. Torrance, Divine and Contingent Order (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981); T. F. Torrance, Christian Theology and Scientific Culture (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981); T. F. Torrance, Transformation and Convergence in the Frame of Knowledge (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984); and T. F. Torrance, Reality and Scientific Theology, vol. 1 in the series Theology and Science at the Frontiers of Knowledge, ed. T. F. Torrance, (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1985). The series Theology and Science at the Frontiers of Knowledge by Scottish Academic Press, of which Torrance was the general editor, in many ways marks the close of Torrance's most serious work in this area. In the late 1980's Torrance began returning to his first love of positive, trinitarian, christocentric theology, with the publication of such works as T. F. Torrance, ed., Theological Dialogue Between Orthodox and Reformed Churches (Edinburgh and London: Scottish Academic Press, 1985); Torrance, Hermeneutics of John Calvin; and especially T. F. Torrance, Trinitarian Faith.

⁷In fact, the unofficial, more complete title of Torrance's The Ground and Grammar of Theology is given in the preface as The Ground and Grammar of a Realist Theology in the Perspective of a Unitary Understanding of the Creation. For a sympathetic discussion of the complexity of Torrance's realism, see Hardy, 76-84. K. A. Richardson notes that Torrance uses a "plurality of realisms" in his writing: "It is not always clear what Torrance wants with his references to the term [realism]. At times he is thinking in terms of an ancient version, at others, a medieval one. At still others, Scottish common-sense realism and finally the scientific or critical realism of the 20th century, come into play" (see Richardson, 199-201). For Torrance's appreciation of Polanyi, see T. F. Torrance, ed., Belief in Science and in Christian Life: The Relevance of Michael Polanyi's Thought for Christian Faith and Life (Edinburgh: Handsel Press, 1980), xiii-xvii and 1-27. See also T. F. Torrance, "The Place of Michael Polanyi in the Modern Philosophy of Science," ch. 3 in Transformation and Convergence, 107ff. For Torrance's use of Polanyi in his own theology, see Torrance, Theological Science, 30; Torrance, God and Rationality, 16; T. F. Torrance, Space, Time and Resurrection (Edinburgh: Handsel Press, 1976), 8, 26; and Torrance, Theology in Reconstruction, 84, 177. One short study has been dedicated exclusively to Polanyi and Torrance (see

Two aspects of every object under scientific observation demand close attention: the internal nature of the object and the interrelations in which it presents itself.⁸ The intrinsic intelligibility of the field of reality--or logos--governs our knowing of that field when considering these two aspects together.⁹ The internal aspect of knowing is especially important if we are to overcome the Kantian idea that we only know based upon appearances or mere positivism.¹⁰

Coates). A short summary of Torrance on Polanyi is given in Alan G. Marley, T. F. Torrance in a Nutshell, Nutshell Series no. 4 (Edinburgh: Handsel Press, 1992), 7-9. The degree to which Polanyi was fundamental to the development of Torrance's thought rather than illustrative of Torrance's own previous epistemological commitments requires further study. Palma acknowledges that Torrance's debt to Polanyi is not so very evident in his christological works. Palma, 211.

⁸Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 2-3.

⁹Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 3. Torrance also refers to this logos as "created rationality" (Torrance, God and Rationality, 139). On the "logos of man," see Torrance, Theological Science, 205.

¹⁰Torrance, Ground and Grammar, 28. In commenting on Torrance's God and Rationality, Klinefelter notes: "The major villain in this piece is Kant . . ." (Donald S. Klinefelter, "God and Rationality: A Critique of the Theology of Thomas F. Torrance," Journal of Religion 53 [1973]: 133). For more on Torrance's critique of Immanuel Kant's idealism, see Torrance, Transformation and Convergence, 36-46; Torrance, Theological Science, 88-92; and Torrance, Ground and Grammar, 23-28. Torrance appears especially to object to Kant's stress on appearance: compare Immanuel Kant, Critique of Pure Reason, trans. Norman Kemp Smith (London: Macmillan, 1929), 265-267 [A249-A250]; and Torrance, Transformation and Convergence, 56, n. 181. Early in his career, delivering his Honorary Presidential Address to the New College Theological Society, Torrance clearly counters Kant: "Without doubt that is extremely difficult for the abstract reason to grasp, for the abstract reason only operates with the idea, with truth in a form in which it is abstracted from existence. But here in Christianity we do not have that gap between ideal and existence, between truth and reality, between a realm of the imagination or vision, and a realm of the conceptual" (Torrance, "The Place and Function of Reason in Christian Theology," 32). For discussions of Torrance's position on Kant, see Harink, 28-32; Kang, 86-91; Colyer, 40-43; and McPake, 360, 390-391, n. 313. Curiously, Kruger's dissertation on Torrance's knowledge of God does not mention Immanuel Kant. For Torrance's critique of positivism, see Torrance, Ground and Grammar, 28-32.

How does the observer come to this inner knowledge of the object in question?

Here intuition plays a critical role in the epistemological process:

Thus we seek to understand something, not by schematising it to an external or alien framework of thought but by operating with a framework of thought appropriate to it, one which it suggests to us out of its inherent constitutive relations and which we are rationally constrained to adopt in faithful understanding and interpretation of it.¹¹

Torrance calls this step by various names: "intuition,"¹² "a significant clue," "a basic clue," "some anticipatory insight,"¹³ and "extra-logical apprehension of unobservable intelligible structures."¹⁴

Most important for this step of intuition are "heard statements":

That is why the basic statements with which we have to do in theology are what I have called elsewhere "hearing statements," or "heard statements," which correspond closely to the "recognition statements," or the basic statements, with which we have to do in mathematics or physics. These are statements of the kind that we are forced to make as our minds fall under the power of the intrinsic rationality of the field we are investigating; not statements that we think up for ourselves, but statements imposed upon us by objective structural relations, which we express aright when we are faithful to the ontological integrity of the unity of form and being, structure and substance, that reality discloses of itself.¹⁵

¹¹Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 3-4.

¹²Torrance, Theological Science, 165, 319. See also Torrance, Ground and Grammar, 30-32, and T. F. Torrance, The Christian Frame of Mind (Edinburgh: Handsel Press, 1985), 11.

¹³Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 3-4.

¹⁴Torrance, Ground and Grammar, 31.

¹⁵Torrance, Ground and Grammar, 31. This category of *intuitiva auditis* is very important for Torrance. See Torrance, Theology in Reconstruction, 81; and T. F. Torrance, Reality and Evangelical Theology (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982), 74ff.

Torrance prefers these "heard statements" to vision oriented modes of knowing.¹⁶

The process of knowing does not end with intuition, however; there it only begins.

Once we have got hold of the basic clue or gained some anticipatory insight into the pattern of things, we set about re-examining and reinterpreting all the data, putting them together under the guidance of the basic insight we have discovered until the full coherent pattern comes clearly into view.¹⁷

On the trail of the truth, some of our ideas may even have to change:

Now of course in a scientific inquiry the fundamental insight with which we work may have to be revised as all the pieces of evidence come together and throw light upon each other, but nevertheless it is under the direction of that insight that the discovery is made. Once the insight has put us on the track of that discovery, something irreversible has taken place in our understanding: a pattern of truth has been built into our minds on which we cannot go back, and which we cannot rationally deny.¹⁸

Within this irreversible process, the rational field, or object of study, relentlessly manifests its true nature to us:

In each field of inquiry, then, we must be faithful to the reality we seek to know and must act and think always in a relation of relentless fidelity to that reality.¹⁹

¹⁶Torrance, Theological Science, 21. Torrance's preference for "heard statements" may well spring from his aversion towards more conceptually rigid "picture models" and attraction to "disclosure models." On this distinction, see Ian T. Ramsey, Models and Mystery, The Whidden Lectures for 1963 (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), 2-10. Torrance is well aware of Ramsey's work in this area. See Torrance, Theology in Reconstruction, 92. For a critique of Torrance's distinction between visual and hearing modes of knowing, see David F. Siemens, Jr., "Two Problems with Torrance," Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith 43 (1991): 112-113; and Harry Wardlaw, "Theology: Art or Science?" in God, Secularization, and History: Essays in Memory of Ronald Gregor Smith, ed. Eugene Thomas Long (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1974), 73-74.

¹⁷Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 4.

¹⁸Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 4.

¹⁹Torrance, Ground and Grammar, 10.

In the end, therefore, not only do we know more, but our whole way of thinking is adjusted through this heuristic process.²⁰

Theological Science

This basic pattern of knowing applies to theology, as well as to the modern sciences, since Torrance conceives of theology as a science in its own right. In theology the Trinity is the rational field or field of intelligibility:

It is the Trinity in this ultimate, ontological sense that the great theologians of the early Church such as Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzus, or Cyril of Alexandria identified with the subject-matter of theology par excellence. In the strictest sense the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is *theologia*, that is, theology in its purest form, the pure science of theology, or *episteme dogmatike*. I myself like to think of the doctrine of the Trinity as the *ultimate ground* of theological knowledge of God, the *basic grammar* of theology, for it is there that we find our knowledge of God reposing upon the final Reality of God himself, grounded in the ultimate relations intrinsic to God's own Being, which govern and control all true knowledge of him from beginning to end.²¹

The immediate object of observation, however, is Jesus Christ, God incarnate:

If God's *Logos* inheres in his own Being eternally, and that *Logos* has become incarnate in Jesus Christ, then it is in and through Christ that we have cognitive access into the Being of God, into his inner divine intelligibility or *Logos*.²²

²⁰Torrance does not develop his epistemology along a purely individualistic line. He does acknowledge and develop the wider community and societal dimension of this heuristic process (see "Chapter 4: The Social Coefficient of Knowledge" in Torrance, Reality and Scientific Theology, 98-130). Colyer analyzes this element of cultural conditioning in Torrance's epistemology (see "Chapter III: Doctrine and Community" in Colyer, 152-219).

²¹Torrance, Ground and Grammar, 158-159.

²²Torrance, Ground and Grammar, 151. From his earliest published writings, Torrance was committed to Christ as the true object of Christian dogmatics. In his Honorary Presidential Address before the New College Theological Society in 1941, Torrance asserts: "The Christian reason which in METANOIA is turned out toward God now becomes determined by its object, its proper object, God in Christ, Whom reason was made to apprehend" (Torrance, "The Place and Function of Reason in

Thus, in theology, it is Jesus Christ that we directly seek to know. The self-revelation of God in Jesus Christ is the source of all theological knowledge.²³

Following the pattern outlined in the previous section, we examine Christ in his interrelations and internal relations. His interrelations include

... the actual matrix of interrelations from which he sprang as Son of David and Son of Mary, that is, in terms of his intimate bond with Israel in its covenanted relationship with God throughout history.²⁴

The covenant, Israel, and even Jesus' specific environment while on earth are all covered under this heading.

Torrance also examines quite carefully Christ's internal relations. This aspect

Christian Theology," 30). During this early period, Torrance calls Christ "the Absolute Subject" of theological thought (T. F. Torrance, "Kierkegaard on the Knowledge of God," The Presbyterian 1 [1943]: 6).

²³For a descriptive treatment of Torrance's doctrine of the knowledge of God, see Kruger. For a summary of this fuller descriptive treatise, see C. Baxter Kruger, "The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God in the Theology of T. F. Torrance," Scottish Journal of Theology 43 (1990): 366-389. On the other hand, in his perceptive study John McPake is more historically sensitive and even gives theological critique of Torrance on the subject (see McPake, especially Chapter 5, "T. F. Torrance on the Nature of God's Revelation: With Particular Reference to, Theological Science," 287-393). Torrance's interest in the self-revelation of God in Jesus Christ dates from the earliest days of his career. His Auburn Seminary Lectures on the doctrine of revelation reflect the profound influence of Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics I/1 and F. W. Camfield's Revelation and the Holy Spirit, which highlight this theme (see T. F. Torrance, "The Christian Doctrine of Revelation," Auburn Seminary Lectures, personal collection of T. F. Torrance, 1-59). For a discussion of the self-revelation of God as a modern concept, see Bruce L. McCormack, Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology: Its Genesis and Development 1909-1936 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 359-360. For a critique of the self-revelation of God in Torrance's theology, see David A. Pailin, The Anthropological Character of Theology (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 5, 23, 50-51, 116-117.

²⁴Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 3. This is a repeated theme in Torrance's writings. For example, see Torrance, Theological Science, 15; Torrance, Space, Time and Resurrection, 15; and Torrance, Trinitarian Faith, 66, 125, 130, 143, 155, 163, 168, 208, 209, 242, 264, 277, 278, 303, 311.

of study includes:

What he is in himself in his internal relations with God, that is, in terms of his intrinsic significance disclosed through his self-witness and self-communication to us in word and deed and reflected through the evangelical tradition of the Gospels in the medium which he created for this purpose in the apostolic foundation of the Church.²⁵

More on this very important point will be said below.

How do we know what of Christ's interrelations and internal relations should be central to our own theological thought? Intuition is the next step in the growth of theological understanding.²⁶ In it "our acts of cognition are formed from beyond them under the power of the Spirit, as He presses upon us from the side of the divine Being."²⁷ Thus, intuition prevents total human subjectivity in theology.²⁸ Revision of

²⁵Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 3.

²⁶This emphasis on intuition in the formation of christology was not unknown in Torrance's theology professor, H. R. Mackintosh. See, for example, H. R. Mackintosh, The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, second edition, 1913), 390.

²⁷T. F. Torrance, "The Epistemological Relevance of the Holy Spirit" in Ex Auditu Verbi: Theologische Opstellen Aangeboden Aan Prof. Dr. G. C. Berkouwer (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1965), 291-292. See also Torrance, Space, Time and Incarnation, 85. Torrance's commitment to a critical role for intuition in theological knowledge is common and was voiced in one of his first publications (see Torrance, The Modern Theological Debate, 16). References to the role of the Holy Spirit in theological intuition are less frequent.

²⁸Because the role played by intuition is so crucial in Torrance's thought, Ronald F. Thiemann charges Torrance is an incoherent foundationalist (see R. F. Thiemann, Revelation and Theology [Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1985], 7, 38-43). Thiemann's accusation has not gone unchallenged. Feenstra and Colyer respond by noting that Torrance is a weak or soft foundationalist, not a classical foundationalist (see Ronald J. Feenstra, Review of Revelation and Theology in Calvin Theological Journal 21 [1986]: 127-130; Colyer, 78-80, n. 123). Oddly, David Tracy charges Torrance with being a strict coherentist (see David Tracy, "The Necessity and Insufficiency of Fundamental Theology" in Problems and Perspectives of Fundamental Theology, ed. René Latourrelle and Gerald O'Collins, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell

our knowledge of the whole range of theology has proceeded along these lines, under the irreversible impact of the self-revelation of God in Jesus Christ.

Therefore, to T. F. Torrance's mind, "what is absolutely central is Jesus Christ."²⁹ There is no other way for us to know God:

There is no God except He who has shown us His Face in Jesus Christ, so that we cannot go behind the back of Christ to find God, or know anything about Him apart from this God, for there is no other God than this God. Here then, it is not some prior ontology, but Christology which is all-determining in our knowledge of God.³⁰

Thus, the whole business of theology ought to be faithful to the object of its study-- Jesus Christ.

Christocentric Dogmatics

What implications does Torrance see in his christocentric approach to theological science for the shape and structure of dogmatics?³¹ Clearly, in giving

[New York: Paulist Press, 1982], 30). On classic and weak foundationalism, as well as coherentism, see Alvin Plantinga, Warrant: The Current Debate (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 67-77; Alvin Plantinga, "Is Belief in God Rational?" in Rationality and Religious Beliefs, ed. C. F. Delaney (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1979), 7-27; William P. Alston, "Two Types of Foundationalism," The Journal of Philosophy 73 (1976): 165-185; and W. P. Alston, "Has Foundationalism Been Refuted?" Philosophical Studies 29 (1976): 287-305.

²⁹Torrance, Theology in Reconstruction, 151.

³⁰Torrance, School of Faith, lxxiii.

³¹For a brief discussion of various types of christocentrism in Ritschl, Harnack, Herrmann, and Barth, see McCormack, 453-455. For a biographical recounting of Torrance's debt to Barth's christocentrism, see Torrance, Karl Barth, Biblical and Evangelical Theologian, 121-123. For further examples of Torrance's christocentricism, see Torrance, School of Faith, lxxx; Torrance, Space, Time and Incarnation, 17; Torrance, Theological Science, 160, 182; and T. F. Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," New College Lectures, personal collection of T. F. Torrance, 1. See also Torrance, School of Faith, xcvi; Torrance, Trinitarian Faith,

coherent expression to the gospel, the theologian ought to compose a theology determined by the nature of Christ himself:

Thus the pattern of the Church's knowledge derives from the Form of Christ Himself, for He is the objective reality which the Church seeks to know and knows as it orders all its knowing in accordance with the nature of the object, that is in conformity to the nature of Christ.³²

However, does this christocentric emphasis imply that all theology reduces to mere christology? Torrance insists not:

The organic unity of all theological knowledge arises not from any categorisation and certainly not from the reduction of every other doctrine to Christology, but from consistent obedience to Christ. The way that the Word has taken in the Incarnation, life, death and resurrection and ascension of Jesus Christ, is the way in which God means us to apprehend and receive His Word.³³

Torrance does not posit that all theology is christology but that all good theology is christological--informed by christology. Every locus in Torrance's theology is, therefore, related to christology, "the core of dogmatics."³⁴

This christocentric influence bridles the traditional tendency to isolate one theological locus from another. When commenting on various aspects of the application of redemption, Torrance illustrates this principle:

Early in life, I had to think that out. How could one separate justification from atonement or justification from reconciliation? I find it very difficult, you see, to separate out justification, reconciliation, atonement, because they are all involved in one another. I don't know how I began to think in this kind of a way. But, we talk about, we separate in our minds justification, sanctification,

49, 59, 64, 255, 263; Torrance, Theology in Reconciliation, 210, 253, 254.

³²Torrance, School of Faith, lx.

³³Torrance, School of Faith, lxiii.

³⁴T. F. Torrance, "The Incarnate Life of the Son in the Union of His Divine and Human Natures," New College Lectures, personal collection of T. F. Torrance, 16.

regeneration, salvation, redemption, and so on. Now are these five different things in God, five different acts? I thought of this with regard to predestination. We talk about predestination, election, eternal decree, the word of God, the love of God, and these are all different. We say they are different. Are we not reading finite distinctions into Godhead? Now [we] distinguish [between] the person and the act--human being and the word. But are they different from God? So in God--word, person, and act are inseparable. So the acts of God--like election, loving, the love of God, the eternal victory of God, the word of God--these are one. So the incarnation is the one word, act, love, election, counsel, decree, and God become incarnate, personally. Now if that is the case, then when you think of what he did, and his word and act are inseparable from his being, then justification, sanctification, atonement, and all of them, they are all one. They are all fundamental unity.³⁵

Thus, there is not so much a removal of these dogmatic categories from Torrance's own thinking as an integrating of them in Christ.

When developing a detailed christocentric dogmatic, Torrance cautions the theologian on two points. First, the object of study is by its very nature beyond our ultimate comprehensive grasp. We can know it, but we cannot know it exhaustively.

Therefore, our theological construct must not be strictly rational or logical:

Deployment of the form of Christ, or rather of obedient conformity to the form and nature of Christ as mystery, must leave room for mystery in the systematic presentation of theological knowledge--that means that in the nature of the case it must forego any kind of system that involves a principle of unbroken rational continuity between its exposition, for that would be to "explain" the mystery, and so to "explain it away."³⁶

³⁵T. F. Torrance, interview by author, 29 January 1990, tape recording. The Church of Scotland's Special Commission on Baptism, which Torrance chaired, somewhat reflects this same attitude when it speaks of "the Christological unity" of justification, sanctification and redemption ("Interim Report of the Special Commission on Baptism," Minutes of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland [May 1958], 704). This tendency has its critics, however. For example, Benjamin Milner objects to Torrance's "dissolution of sanctification in justification" (Benjamin C. Milner, Calvin's Doctrine of the Church, vol. 5 in Studies in the History of Christian Thought, ed. Heiko O. Oberman, et. al. [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970], 167, n. 8).

³⁶Torrance, School of Faith, lxi.

All departments of theology are thus developed under the influence of Christ's self-disclosure, determined by the nature of Christ himself. Because of his highly christocentric approach, Torrance eliminates "unbroken rational continuity" in theology, preserving mystery as a part of man's wider dogmatic formulations.

To remove the mystery would also be unfaithful to the Holy Spirit:

At no point can we allow purely logical connexion to displace the Communion of the Spirit. Logical connexion is involved, for the exposition of the whole Gospel must be made in an orderly way through the use of grammar and correct sequences in expression and thought, but these must never be allowed to determine the essential forms that theology shall take, nor allowed to cramp the expression of the Truth and so humanise and domesticate and distort it by thrusting it into the straight-jacket of fixed and necessary thought-forms. That would be an attempt to force the objective truth and being to conform to our thought about it, rather than to conform our thought to the objective truth and being we are seeking to understand and know.³⁷

Mystery and the irresolvable are not indications of weakness in a theology, according to T. F. Torrance, but the birthright of all proper theological thought. Mystery is, therefore, essential.³⁸

One major example of residual mystery in Torrance's wider theology is "the mystery of iniquity":

Evil involves a radical discontinuity which cannot be explained in terms of

³⁷Torrance, School of Faith, lxi-lxii. On mystery in theological constructs, see also Torrance, Theology in Reconstruction, 185-86; Torrance, God and Rationality, 22; T. F. Torrance, Space, Time and Incarnation (London: Oxford University Press, 1969), 21; Torrance, The Trinitarian Faith, 158, 168, 215; T. F. Torrance, Royal Priesthood: A Theology of Ordained Ministry (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, second edition, 1993), 95; Torrance, "The Hypostatic Union," 1-2; and Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 1.

³⁸For another perspective on the question of mystery in theology in general and christology in particular, see Steven Z. Katz, "The Language and Logic of Mystery in Christology," in Christ, Faith and History: Cambridge Studies in Christology, ed. S. W. Sykes and J. P. Clayton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 239-261.

continuity without explaining it away. By its irrational nature, the mystery of iniquity, as the New Testament speaks of it, cannot be explained for the discontinuity it involves is absolutely unbridgable.³⁹

Tracing the inner connections in Torrance's theology between Christ and evil is beyond the scope of this study.⁴⁰ However, Torrance clearly sees a link between the two, decrying in no uncertain terms all attempts to reason through this unresolved segment of dogmatics:

The connection between the atoning death of the Lord Jesus and the forgiveness of our sins is of an altogether ineffable kind which we may not and cannot reduce to a chain of this-worldly logico-causal relations. To do that comes very near to sinning against the Holy Spirit.⁴¹

These are strong words, coming from such an ecumenically-minded theologian as T. F. Torrance. But he goes on to repeat his conclusions with even greater vigor, labeling the two doctrines under consideration as

... twin heresies which rest on a deeper heresy, the recourse to a logico-causal explanation of why the atoning death of the Lord Jesus Christ avails or does not avail for all people. Any such an attempt at logico-causal explanation of the efficacy and range of the atonement is surely a form of blasphemy against

³⁹T. F. Torrance, "The Atonement--The Singularity of Christ and the Finality of the Cross: The Atonement and the Moral Order" in Universalism and the Doctrine of Hell, ed. N. M. de S. Cameron (Carlisle and Grand Rapids: Paternoster Press and Baker Book House, 1993), 247. A shorter version of this same paper was read at the 1991 Rutherford House Dogmatics Conference in Edinburgh.

⁴⁰Torrance traces the internal and external connections between Christ, evil, and the moral order in "The Atonement--The Singularity of Christ and the Finality of the Cross," 225-256. On this issue in Torrance's thought, see the extensive examination by Richard Kirby of King's College, London (Kirby, 190-238).

⁴¹Torrance, "The Atonement--The Singularity of Christ and the Finality of the Cross," 247. The two particular culprits Torrance has in mind here are the doctrines of universalism and limited atonement. This polemic in Torrance's theology has not gone unnoticed. See Don Cupitt, Review of Theological Science and Space, Time and Incarnation by T. F. Torrance, in Church Quarterly 2 (1970): 264.

the blood of Christ.⁴²

Clearly, paradox and mystery flowing from Christ are not only Torrance's theological prerequisites, but they are indeed absolutes.

In summary, it is no embarrassment to the Edinburgh theologian when he reaches a point in his dogma where he must stop description. In fact, the irreconcilable is an imperative woven into the very fabric of Torrance's theology, because of the nature of the object of theological investigation. These unresolved "loose ends" are not intended to denigrate or unnecessarily complicate dogmatics, but rather to more accurately describe the truth under consideration, even Jesus Christ himself.

Beyond the need for mystery, the second caution Torrance sounds for the theologian is against the absolutizing of any theological system. Because our knowledge of Christ the object is not exhaustive but rather limited, our understanding of Christ cannot be absolutized into a theological system:

The "logic" or "form" of Christ in its subjective deployment by theology to give it a coherent pattern corresponding to that in the objective reality can never be absolutised or turned into an archetypal category by means of which all exposition of Christian doctrine is to be categorised or schematised. Thus even the "form" of Christ, truly and faithfully formulated as it may be, cannot be detached from Christ Himself and then used in any thoroughly schematic way in order to force the whole account of Christian teaching into a definite and necessary pattern.⁴³

A theological construct must, therefore, always be in subordination to theological content:

There can be no doubt that some formalism of this kind is as required as it is

⁴²Torrance, "The Atonement--The Singularity of Christ and the Finality of the Cross," 248.

⁴³Torrance, School of Faith, lxii. See also Torrance, Trinitarian Faith, 158, 168.

inescapable, but it must be handled only in abject subordination to the content, for its sole purpose is to serve the exposition of the content.⁴⁴

The true Christ comes first, not our finite understanding or presentation of him.

The Doctrine of Christ

With the above background in mind, I now move more particularly to Torrance's formulation of christology. It is here that the immediate framework of Torrance's doctrine of union with Christ--especially carnal union with Christ--is found. Since Torrance's approach to theological science bears the definite marks of his epistemology, it comes as little surprise that the same should be true of his christology in general and union with Christ in particular.

In this section, as in the one before, I will not develop my own outline of presentation, but will follow Torrance's lead, lest a foreign framework subtly twist his content. However, instead of patterning the discussion after a published work by Torrance, I will follow Torrance's own outline in his unpublished New College lectures, since it is the clearest systematic treatment we have from him.⁴⁵ In his New College lectures, Torrance presents christology at least twice: once in an overview lecture titled "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ" and later in expanded form. Because it highlights the key points that are filled out in later lectures, in this section I will follow the outline of Torrance's introductory lecture.⁴⁶ Other published and

⁴⁴Torrance, School of Faith, lxii.

⁴⁵Guthridge notes the systematic nature of Torrance's New College Lectures, as contrasted with his published works. See Guthridge, 8-9.

⁴⁶See T. F. Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," New College Lectures, personal collection of T. F. Torrance. This lecture is divided into five numbered but

unpublished material by Torrance will be added to this more systematic treatment.

Nicene Christology

"Who is Jesus Christ?"⁴⁷ To that question, which is all important for the Christian faith, there are a wide variety of approaches and answers. How does T. F. Torrance respond?

In his 1939 christology lectures at Auburn Theological Seminary, the young T. F. Torrance draws attention to the importance of this question and boldly asserts a way forward:

It is my conviction that the Person of Christ has too often been studied without close attention to His Work. Cf. HRM: "In point of fact it is at the Cross that the full meaning of 'God in Christ' has broken on the human mind."⁴⁸

In the context of his day, Mackintosh was seen as calling for more emphasis on Christ's work:

Systematic theology generally--so far as we have any--has been and still is influenced by the prevailing tendency of the last century to work mainly with the idea of Incarnation, but in the work of theologians such as Dr. Mackintosh, Dr. Forsyth, Dr. Garvie, Dr. Mozley, a certain reaction may be felt. These writers betray a manifest note of uneasiness in the present situation, and a fear that the peculiarly Christian emphasis upon the Cross may be failing to find proper expression. Unless the doctrine of the Incarnation is nailed to the Cross

untitled sections. My section titles here are drawn from the content of each section in the introductory lecture. While Kang knows of this lecture, he uses it only once in his dissertation, and his line of argument does not reflect Torrance's own presentation of christology. See Kang, 321, n. 51.

⁴⁷Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 1. This question is Torrance's starting point in this unpublished lecture.

⁴⁸T. F. Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," Auburn Seminary Lectures, personal collection of T. F. Torrance, unnumbered preface. This is the complete preface; no reference to the quote by Torrance's late theology professor, H. R. Mackintosh, is given.

it tends to lose definition and to evaporate into a cosmic principle.⁴⁹

Thus, Torrance appears to be echoing his late theology professor's interest in integrating the person and work of Christ so as to protect the cross.⁵⁰

The early Torrance's emphasis on the work of Christ was influenced not only by Mackintosh but by the convictions of Scottish theologian P. T. Forsyth. Later in the Auburn christology lectures, Torrance quotes approvingly:

Theologically, faith in Christ means that the person of Christ must be interpreted by what that saving action of God in him requires, that Christ's work is the master key to His person, that His benefits interpret His nature. It means, when theologically put, that Christology is the corollary of Soteriology
...⁵¹

In his day, Forsyth was seen, perhaps even more than Mackintosh, as a defender of Christ's work:

Of the recurrence of Greek Patristic soteriology, so apparent in the work of Moberly, there was no trace in Forsyth. Notions of humanity in the abstract and of its incorporation in Christ were quite alien to him. . . . Forsyth is one of the few great theologians who have refused to think about Christ in terms of the Two Natures' formula and yet have preserved the full value of the orthodox

⁴⁹John Martin Creed, "Recent Tendencies in English Christology," in Mysterium Christi: Christological Studies By British and German Theologians, ed. G. K. A. Bell and D. Adolf Deissmann (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1930), 129.

⁵⁰Mackintosh summarizes the balance he is seeking to redress: "In conclusion, it may be noted that if the work of Christ illuminates His person, the converse proposition also holds good. The work is made luminous by the person." H. R. Mackintosh, 341.

⁵¹P. T. Forsyth, The Person and Place of Jesus Christ, The Congregational Union Lecture for 1909 (London: Congregational Union of England and Wales and Hodder and Stoughton, 1909), 6; quoted in Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 21, extra sheet 2. Two extra sheets are inserted into the lecture after page 21 and titled "The Doctrine of Christ: The Dogmatic Christ." See also Forsyth, 3-4; quoted in Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 21, extra sheet 1. Torrance's debt to Forsyth at this early stage in his development is evident. See Appendix 3.

Thus, the young Torrance was travelling in the christological orbit of at least two influential Scotsmen--H. R. Mackintosh and P. T. Forsyth--on this issue.

Later in these same christology lectures, Torrance returns to this theme of uniting the person and work of Christ:

Too often have the works of Christ in teaching or in Atonement been thought of in abstraction from His Person; His works issue from His Person and what Christ is in His acts on the Cross He is in His own person.⁵³

Thus, at this early stage in 1939 Torrance appears to be exploring ways in which to integrate the person and work of Christ in his theology.

Later in life, Torrance's approach to this important issue of how to reconcile the person and work of Christ appears to shift from the cross to the person of Christ:

Hence we must allow the Person of Christ to determine for us the nature of His saving work, rather than the other way around.⁵⁴

In his 1966 New College Lectures he expands on this theme:

⁵²John Kenneth Mozley, "Christology and Soteriology," in Mysterium Christi: Christological Studies By British and German Theologians, ed. G. K. A. Bell and D. Adolf Deissmann (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1930), 182-183. For a more recent appraisal of Forsyth, see S. W. Sykes, "Theology through History," in The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology in the Twentieth Century, vol. II, ed. David F. Ford (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989), 6-11.

⁵³Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 245. Torrance references two sources in this section: Mackintosh, 341; and Brunner, The Mediator: A Study of the Central Doctrine of the Christian Faith, trans. Olive Wyon (London and Redhill: Lutterworth Press, 1934), 401-409. Some years later, however, Torrance would criticize Brunner for interpreting the person of Christ too inductively in The Mediator. See T. F. Torrance, "Predestination in Christ," Evangelical Quarterly 13 (1941): 139, n. 72. Torrance continues to work through the relationship between the person and work of Christ later in his Auburn Seminary lectures on christology. See Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 251-253 and 269-280.

⁵⁴Torrance, God and Rationality, 64.

Formulated in answer to the question Who is Jesus Christ? Christology is forced to speak of him from the start as God and man in one Person: and therefore speaks of the being and person of Jesus Christ in terms of his reality in God and of God himself in terms of his self-revelation and self-communication in this man.⁵⁵

This priority of Christ's person is in complete harmony with Torrance's epistemology and theological science, which emphasize the interrelations and internal relations of Christ for dogmatics.

Does this new priority, however, indicate that Torrance lost interest in integrating Christ's person and work in his theology in light of the cross? Not at all. While the mature Torrance begins with Christ's person in his dogmatic endeavor, his concern is still to reconcile the incarnation and atonement, the person and the work of Christ.⁵⁶ In his mature conviction that our thinking must start with Christ's person, Torrance is only indicating where we begin in our process of knowing.

Who, then, is Jesus Christ? When studying the person of Christ, Torrance again acknowledges the place of mystery. The theologian quickly encounters "the mystery of Christ":

This is the bewildering miracle of Jesus, what the New Testament calls the mystery of Christ: that in the indivisible reality of Jesus Christ we meet true man and true God.⁵⁷

⁵⁵Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 1.

⁵⁶Later in his New College lectures, Torrance asserts the "unity of Person and Work" and even the "identity of Person and Work in Christ." T. F. Torrance, "The Continuous Union in the Historical Life and Obedience of Jesus," New College Lectures, personal collection of T. F. Torrance, 2-3.

⁵⁷Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 1. This theme of "the mystery of Christ" does not appear in the Auburn Seminary lectures but is quite prominent in the New College lectures. One fifteen-page lecture is titled "The Mystery of Christ," in which Torrance treats μυστήριον, πρόθεσις, and κοινωνία, as well as trinitarian

Therefore, because "the mystery of Christ" defies exact description, humans can never know everything about his person or even ultimately resolve the implications of his status within their dogmatic formulations.⁵⁸ Our christological knowledge is, therefore, inevitably partial and dynamic, culminating in a "doxological approach to the person of Christ."⁵⁹

What then can be said in the face of this "mystery of Christ"? Are we left speechless? To the contrary, even in this context of dogmatic mystery and doxology, Torrance insists we have something quite profound to say about Christ, but only by a fundamental intuitional insight:

Looking back we can say that the Apostles and Fathers came upon a basic insight in the light of which the whole saving Event of Jesus Christ came to be understood out of its intrinsic intelligibility and within the framework of objective meaning which it created for itself in the context of Israel. The fundamental clue with which they operated was the oneness of Jesus Christ, the Jew from Bethlehem and Nazareth, with God the Father on the one hand and with the unique fact and history of Israel among the nations on the other hand.⁶⁰

mystery, such as the pre-existence of Christ (T. F. Torrance, "The Mystery of Christ," New College Lecture, personal collection of T. F. Torrance). This "mystery of Christ" is stressed by Torrance in his New College Lectures at key points in a dozen different contexts and is a major theme in Torrance's theology.

⁵⁸"Even then we know it remains a mystery: that in the midst of its disclosure it remains something ultimately miraculous and inconceivable, which we cannot master or control through our own modes of thought and speech, for it is finally explicable only from the side of God." Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ", 1.

⁵⁹"We can only acknowledge it in wonder and thankfulness, in adoration and praise, while allowing our mind and understanding to fall under the power of its reality This doxological approach to the person of Christ is the first step in the doctrine of Christ" Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ", 1.

⁶⁰Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 4-5. Torrance also stresses the historical occasion of this intuition's appearance, pointing to the resurrection and Pentecost: "When the crucified Jesus rose again from the dead and poured out his Spirit at Pentecost, the

In keeping with the pattern of his epistemology seen above, Torrance here stresses the two parts of this "basic insight" or "fundamental clue"--Christ's Israelite interrelational context and his internal relation with God the Father.

On occasion, the first part of this intuitional insight is described as the context in which the second appears:

Within that complex of interrelations they found themselves coming to grips with the essential message of the Gospel embodied in Jesus in its relation to the age-old message of God that had been worked out in his covenant partnership with Israel, and discovered that it was a message for the salvation of all mankind.⁶¹

Not infrequently, Christ's Israelite interrelational context appears to fade into the background of Torrance's presentation of Christ's internal relation with God the Father:

It is this relation of mutuality and exclusiveness between Jesus Christ and God, between the Son and the Father, which is the innermost mystery of Christ, his 'secret' which goes back into eternity, but is now revealed in the Gospel. This is the very heart of the Christian faith.⁶²

Thus, although Torrance can present the two-part, God-given intuitional insight in a more limited way, the importance of Christ's Jewish context and the Old Testament should not be overlooked in Torrance's theology.⁶³

intrinsic significance of his Person and all he had said and done broke forth in its self-evidencing power and seized hold of the Church as the very Word or *Logos* of God." Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 4.

⁶¹Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 5.

⁶²Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 1. Elsewhere, Torrance calls the Father/Son relation the real "Messianic secret." Torrance, "The Mystery of Christ," 1.

⁶³Torrance's christology lectures begin with a treatment of the Old Testament and New Testament witness to Christ. Most interestingly, Torrance's treatment of the incarnation begins with a separate lecture on Israel as historical and theological

This basic clue of the Father/Son relation provides the basis on which Torrance asserts the exclusive nature of the self-revelation of God in Jesus Christ:

Then who is Jesus Christ? What are we to say about his being and his person? In answer the Early Church found itself forced to acknowledge that what God is toward us in Jesus Christ in revealing and saving action, he is in himself, and what Jesus Christ is toward us in this revealing and saving action, he is in himself, inherently, in his own being and person In answer to the question Who is he? Christians had to say, He is one with God himself; the Son and the Father are one, one God. What Christ is on earth in his own being he is antecedently in the eternal being of God: he is God of God, by whom all things were made.⁶⁴

Not short-lived in its impact, this fundamental theological insight continued to have an ever widening influence on Christian thinking:

The basic clue with which those Church theologians worked, as we can see in the Council of Nicaea in the early fourth century, was the Father/Son or Son/Father relationship. They developed this clue through careful exegesis of a host of biblical passages in which they sought to distil the essential heart of the Gospel and the fundamental relations which it involved.⁶⁵

background to the incarnation. See T. F. Torrance, "The Incarnation and Old Israel," New College Lectures, personal collection of T. F. Torrance. This pattern of presentation is mirrored in Torrance's The Mediation of Christ, which includes an opening chapter on Christ and Israel. See Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 1-23.

⁶⁴Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 1. The extra emphasis here on knowing God as he is in himself was not a point on which the younger Torrance could agree, but is a later development: "The Incarnation is God's giving Himself to man as an object to be known. All Christian knowledge starts from this historical Person, a real Man. That is why Luther said once, 'I cling to the humanity of Christ.' But although Christ is God become Man, yet not ceasing to be God, we must add that even in Christ we cannot know God as He is in Himself: we know God as He is in Christ. However, Christ is the 'express image' of God, and corresponds perfectly with God's reality. Further, in the Incarnation, God shows respect for our humanity and rationality; that is why Christianity is fundamentally opposed to all irrationalism" (Torrance, The Modern Theological Debate, 12). In his seminal study, John McPake identifies this principle of the self-revelation of God as "the principle of continuity underlying Torrance's history of theology" (McPake, 11).

⁶⁵Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 53.

Eventually, this key insight of the oneness of Jesus and God was given creedal status within the church:

It is at this point also that we may discern the crucial significance of the Nicene assertion of the oneness in being between the incarnate Son and God the Father, instead of the assertion of a likeness in being between them. In point of fact, it was held, Jesus Christ could only be really like God in being if he were actually of one and the same being with him. What was at stake in the Nicene Council was the supreme truth of the deity of Christ and thus the identity between the content of God's revelation in Jesus Christ and God himself.⁶⁶

That is the conviction formulated in the homoousion. . . . As such the homoousion of the Nicene Creed is the core of all Christian theology, the whole faith compressed in a word, the ultimate statement of belief--i.e. the central affirmation to which the basic affirmations of the Christian faith are all essentially related.⁶⁷

This key intuitional insight of an internal relation between God and Jesus Christ leads Torrance to give strong support to the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed and its "king-pin" or "linchpin," the homoousion.⁶⁸ When doing christology, therefore, Torrance

⁶⁶T. F. Torrance, "The Christian Apprehension of God," in Speaking the Christian God: The Holy Trinity and the Challenge of Feminism, ed. A. F. Kimel, Jr. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 134.

⁶⁷Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 1. However, Torrance's enthusiasm for Nicene christology was not always so unbounded. Earlier in life, he described this christology as "somewhat static and metaphysical." See T. F. Torrance, review of The Letters of Saint Athanasius concerning the Holy Spirit by C. R. B. Shapland, in Scottish Journal of Theology 5 (1952): 205-208.

⁶⁸For the homoousion as "king-pin," see T. F. Torrance, Introduction to The Incarnation: Ecumenical Studies in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed A.D. 381, ed. T. F. Torrance (Edinburgh: Handsel Press, 1981), xi. For the homoousion as "linchpin," see Torrance, Ground and Grammar of Theology, 40. For a summary by Torrance of this theological homoousion, see Torrance, The Incarnation, xi-xxii; Torrance, Ground and Grammar of Theology, 39-40; and T. F. Torrance, Trinitarian Faith, 116-145. For a summary of this important doctrine in Torrance's theology and its implications, see Kang, 184-244; and Kang Phee Seng, "The Epistemological Significance of Homoousion in the Theology of Thomas F. Torrance," Scottish Journal of Theology 45 (1992): 341-366. Torrance has also attempted to apply the Nicene homoousion to physics; for more on "the homoousion of physics," see Torrance,

assigns the prominent position in dogmatic thinking to the Nicene homoousion.⁶⁹

Torrance's formidable stress on the Father/Son relation and the Nicene homoousion should not be construed as excluding any reference to the Holy Spirit. On the contrary, in the closing sentence of the first section of his New College lecture "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," Torrance adds a clear affirmation of the importance of the Spirit:

It must be added, however, that the doxological approach to Christ expressed in Nicene theology means that when we speak of Jesus Christ as Son of God, and God of God, we do so in the very same breath in which we speak of the Father and the Holy Spirit; that is, to speak in ontological terms of the being and work of Christ, as human and divine, is only possible in the trinitarian context of the self-communication of God, as a movement from the Father through the Son and in the Spirit who are worshipped and adored and glorified as one God.⁷⁰

This caveat does not, however, always appear when Torrance is treating the topic of

Ground and Grammar, 162-163. McPake and Webster raise a number of questions about Torrance's treatment of the Nicene homoousios and Athanasius, to which we shall return (see McPake, 25-29; and J. Webster, Review of The Trinitarian Faith by T. F. Torrance, in Themelios 16 [1990]: 32). At this juncture, it is sufficient to note that the title "Nicene Christology" for this section should not be construed as implying that Torrance merely repeats fourth-century beliefs and creedal formulations with the reserve of a patristic historian. Instead, this historical theological reference and those of later sections--which are drawn in substance if not language from his overview christology lecture--are meant to highlight Torrance's self-conscious appropriation of historic christological themes. It is our contention, however, that his development of these themes is unique.

⁶⁹Torrance can also assert the importance of the Nicene homoousion with persuasive homiletical power: "Once again, everything hinges on the ontic structure expressed by the *homoousion* in its distillation of the sense of Scripture even in these matters, for it was a structure that withstood the fearful strain and ordeal of the crucifixion, and came through unbroken in the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and as such binds Jesus Christ indivisibly with God Almighty in the last things" (Torrance, The Incarnation, xv).

⁷⁰Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 1.

the homooousion.⁷¹ But what is clear by this reference to the Holy Spirit in the context of the Nicene homooousion is that Torrance's christology looks beyond Nicea towards further christological developments.⁷² To these further developments in Torrance's unpublished lectures I now turn.

Chalcedonian Christology

In probing "the mystery of Christ," T. F. Torrance also frequently employs the Chalcedonian doctrine of Christ:

From the homooousion the Christian Church goes on to speak more explicitly of Christ as he in whom divine and human nature are united in one Person, for Jesus Christ is not the union of two persons in the one common nature but the union of two natures in one Person. This was formulated in the doctrine of the hypostatic union.⁷³

The four great Chalcedonian "notes," which protect the person of Christ from the confusion, conversion, division, or separation of his divine and human natures, are an appropriate manner in which to speak of Christ's mystery. They are a formulation of open structure, in which the understanding of Christ's divine-

⁷¹For example, note the near silence on the Holy Spirit in one of Torrance's major treatments of the Nicene homooousion (Torrance, The Incarnation, xi-xxii).

⁷²Torrance is here signalling development of this Nicene theme. He is well aware that the theological connection between the Nicene homooousion and pneumatology was not well developed until after Nicea: "Thus the doctrine of the *homooousion* of the Spirit, with its unequivocal assertion of the Deity of the Holy Spirit, that emerged in this period between Nicaea and Constantinople, helped the Church to grasp more appropriately and more spiritually, and therefore more adequately, the *homooousion* of the Son to the Father and indeed the ultimate relations of being within the Holy Trinity." Torrance, Trinitarian Faith, 195.

⁷³Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 1-2.

human reality respects its mystery or ineffability⁷⁴

As seen with the Nicene christology above, the Chalcedonian christology

cannot be regarded as merely a theory so much as the organized form of apprehension and conceptualization forced upon the Church by the ontic necessity of the given reality of God in Jesus Christ, although admittedly it cannot be confined within the concepts and statements used.⁷⁵

Thus, even though brought about by an irrepressible intuitional insight, Torrance emphasizes the openness or flexibility of Chalcedon to future development or refinement.⁷⁶

Indeed, he goes on to further clarify the role of Chalcedonian christology in theological thinking:

This formulation of the doctrine of Christ is to be looked on as constituting not a picturing model, but a disclosure-model, i.e. a cognitive instrument, through which we allow the reality of Christ's being and person to shine across to us, or a structure of thought through which we are helped to grasp something of the personal being of the incarnate Son in his inner relation and not just in his relations toward us.⁷⁷

Not only is this christology open-structured, but Torrance identifies it as a "disclosure model," a term with which he was familiar from the 1963 Whidden Lectures of Ian

⁷⁴Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 2. Here, Torrance emphasizes the Chalcedonian definition by quoting a large portion of it, which he does for no other theological statement in his New College lectures.

⁷⁵Torrance, Space, Time and Incarnation, 81.

⁷⁶"As such the Chalcedonian Definition is a subtle and flexible analogue, provided with the means of its own correction, so that when used rightly it invites reconstruction in view of the fuller disclosure of the reality it serves and proclaims its own inadequacy and limitation by a logical suspension of form so that it cannot be made a substitute for the truth of the divine Word" (Torrance, Theological Science, 246). For more on "open concepts," see Torrance, Space, Time and Incarnation, 21.

⁷⁷Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 2.

Ramsey.⁷⁸ Ramsey champions disclosure models in theology for their ability to provide in a moment of insight "structural echoes" of the "web of relationship in an original."⁷⁹ In contrast, the mathematical precision of picturing models is inappropriate to theology.⁸⁰ Thus, for Torrance, the Chalcedonian formula, while not truth in itself, is a means by which some of the truth of Christ and his relationship to God and man is

⁷⁸Torrance was familiar with Ramsey's work (see Torrance, Theology in Reconstruction, 92). In addition to Chalcedonian christology, Torrance identifies the Bible as a disclosure model as well: "I recall that Calvin spoke of Holy Scripture as the spectacles that God gives us through which we apprehend the truth of God. This means that we look through the Holy Scriptures. That's just the way that we develop our scientific theories. They are transparent 'disclosure-models' through which we allow the truth in the creation as it has come to us from God to shine through us" (I. John Hesselink, "A Pilgrimage in the School of Christ--An Interview with T. F. Torrance," Reformed Review 38 [1984]: 64).

⁷⁹Ramsey, 9-10. With his very down-to-earth style, Ramsey reminds his readers, "The great virtue of a model is that it enables us to be articulate when before we were tongue-tied" (Ramsey, 13). The three great benefits Ramsey sees to disclosure models is that they can function as "builders of discourse," "simplify complex discourse," and "enable us to talk of what eludes us" (Ramsey, 14-15). In developing his "disclosure models," Ramsey draws quite heavily from the work of Max Black on "analogue models" (see Max Black, Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy [Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1962], 222). For critiques of this school of models, see Ian G. Barbour, Myths, Models and Paradigms: The Nature of Scientific and Religious Language (London: SCM Press, 1974), 63; and Iris M. Yob, "Religious Metaphor and Scientific Model: Grounds for Comparison," Religious Studies 28 (1992): 475-485. Yob charges Black and his followers with "appeals to unexplained meaning changes." In short, they do not explain how or why their metaphors work as lenses, screens, or filters. See Yob, 477.

⁸⁰Ramsey, 9-10. Of theological disclosure models, Ramsey explains: "A model in theology does not stand or fall with, a theological model is not judged for its success or failure by reference to, the possibility of verifiable deductions. It is rather judged by its stability over the widest possible range of phenomena, by its ability to incorporate the most diverse phenomena not inconsistently As a model in theology is developed, it rather stands or falls according to its success (or otherwise) in harmonizing whatever events are to hand" (Ramsey, 16-17). In theology, Ramsey recommends use of more than one disclosure model: "In this way theology demands and thrives on a diversity of models; theological discourse must never be uniformly flat" (Ramsey, 60).

disclosed.

Concluding his brief introduction to Chalcedonian christology in his unpublished New College lectures, Torrance summarizes:

Regarded in this way the Chalcedonian formulation of the doctrine of Christ is a formulation subordinated to the reality it seeks to express, and allows itself to be relativised by that reality: it is an open structure formed under the pressure of the self-manifestation of Christ, and therefore a structure open to constant refinement and adaptation under the action of the same Christ.⁸¹

Therefore, the Chalcedonian christology is not to be used slavishly, according to Torrance. It must submit to "constant refinement and adaptation" under the influence of Christ through time. Theological mystery, therefore, does not exclude an important role for classic Christian statements of faith in dogmatics, but their role in Torrance's mind is more that of a "cognitive instrument" through which the truth is disclosed rather than that of truth itself.

Thus, Torrance supports a modified usage of this ancient christological formula. Elsewhere, the Council of Chalcedon's statement on the person of Christ is strongly commended by Torrance:

When we think of Jesus Christ in Himself, in the mystery of His own Person, the Chalcedonian formulation is quite adequate, for it expresses all that we can say, warding off on each side harmful error and reminding us that here we are face to face with a mystery that is more to be adored than expressed.⁸²

The work of Christ is not, however, given enough consideration by Chalcedon, to Torrance's mind:

⁸¹Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 2.

⁸²T. F. Torrance, "The Atonement and the Oneness of the Church," Scottish Journal of Theology 7 (1954): 247. This article was later reprinted as chapter 3 of part 2 of T. F. Torrance, Conflict and Agreement, vol. 1, Order and Disorder (London: Lutterworth Press, 1959), 238-262.

But when, on the other hand, we think of His mission in relation to sinful man, . . . then the Chalcedonian formulation does not say enough, for reconciliation is not something added to hypostatic union so much as the hypostatic union itself at work in expiation atonement. Following the Epistle to the Hebrews, we must give the hypostatic union more dynamic expression⁸³

Thus, the person and the work of Christ must not be so sharply divided in our understanding, and a more dynamic presentation of the hypostatic union is required than is provided by the original Chalcedonian formula.

But how does Torrance present the Chalcedonian person of Christ more dynamically? How does Torrance display "the hypostatic union itself at work"? Perhaps this question is best answered by noting how Torrance puts the hypostatic union to work in revelation and reconciliation.⁸⁴

In his unpublished Auburn Seminary lectures, Torrance's concern to integrate the person and work of Christ is evident in his doctrine of revelation. In his lectures entitled "The Christian Doctrine of Revelation," the young Torrance stresses:

That means therefore that we can only know God in an ACT in which HIS ACT AND PERSON are IDENTICAL, in which God's presence, personal presence, is present in His act, in which the act is the Person and the Person is the Act. Now that is obviously unthinkable in any sort of rational terminology that we are used to thinking along the analogies of what we know antecedently in our world. . . . Nothing but God Himself in Person will suffice to bridge the Gulf between man and God, between Creator and Creation, between dependent existence and independent original existence.⁸⁵

⁸³Torrance, "The Atonement and the Oneness of the Church," 247.

⁸⁴Although his brief "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ" ends without discussing these topics, the fuller treatment of the hypostatic union later in his New College lectures includes a discussion of its dynamic implications for revelation and reconciliation. See T. F. Torrance, "The Hypostatic Union," unpublished New College Lectures, personal collection of T. F. Torrance.

⁸⁵T. F. Torrance, "The Christian Doctrine of Revelation," Auburn Seminary Lectures, personal collection of T. F. Torrance, 31. Torrance's debt to Barth in his

This theme of the unity of person and work is repeated in the Auburn Seminary lecture entitled "The Christian Doctrine of God: A Constructive Account," but with clearer reference to the incarnation.⁸⁶

Also, in the early Auburn Seminary lecture "The Character of Theological Thought," Torrance reasons that the humanity of Christ as taught in the Chalcedonian hypostatic union is a "principle which runs like a golden thread throughout this central doctrine, characterizing other doctrines."⁸⁷ What difference does this "golden thread"

treatment of revelation is obvious. By this period, Torrance had access to Thomson's translation of CD I/1 and the German original, as well as KD I/2, which he was in the process of working through in Auburn. By this point in his life Torrance also had access to Barth's The Word of God and the Word of Man, God in Action, Resurrection, God's Search for Man, Anselm and article in Revelation. Compare Appendix 2; Torrance, "The Christian Doctrine of Revelation," 10-15; Torrance, "My Interaction with Karl Barth," 52-54; and Hesselink, 52-53. However, Torrance's Basel experience with Barth is perhaps in the background of his thought here, especially Barth's lectures on the Act and Being of God, which later were published as part of KD II/1. In the winter term of 1938 in Basel, Torrance had heard Barth lecture on part of KD II/1 and Colossians, and he participated in a seminar on natural theology and possibly a discussion group on Wolleb. In the summer term of 1938 in Basel, Torrance had heard Barth lecture on a subsequent portion of KD II/1 and I Peter, and he possibly participated in a seminar on Calvin and baptism and a discussion group again on Wolleb. Compare Appendix 2; Eberhard Busch, Karl Barth: His Life from Letters and Autobiographical Texts, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), 267, 285-286; Torrance, "My Interaction with Karl Barth," 52-54; and Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics II/1, ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, trans. T. H. L. Parker, W. B. Johnston, Harold Knight, J. L. M. Haire (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1957), 257-272.

⁸⁶T. F. Torrance, "The Christian Doctrine of God: A Constructive Account," Auburn Seminary Lectures, personal collection of T. F. Torrance, 51: "The Incarnation of God in Jesus Christ is the great act whereby God draws near to men and makes Himself known to them. Christ is the act of God toward man, an act in which person and work of God are identical. This nearness is the basis of all Christian fellowship and of all communion with God."

⁸⁷T. F. Torrance, "The Character of Theological Thought," Auburn Seminary Lectures, personal collection of T. F. Torrance, 26.



of Christ's humanity make for dogmatics?

There is no strange doctrine in a true systematic theology. All the different teachings and dogmas bear a family likeness. They were born from the mind of God, and conform thereto. . . . Our task will be to make these [family likenesses] evident and so to let theology criticise itself, as it were, to allow the doctrines which are inherently of the same tissue to come together and coalesce into an organic unity.⁸⁸

Torrance's concern to integrate the person and work of Christ in the doctrine of revelation by a more dynamic development of the Chalcedonian formula is not limited to his Auburn lectures. In his 1941 honorary presidential address to the New College Theological Society, the denouement of Torrance's speech reads:

It is therefore at that point where we have God and man in hypostatic union that we can talk of the true point-of-contact (Anknüpfungspunkt) between God and man. The only place where the human mind, while engaged in perfectly true mental activity, may get across to God is in Jesus Christ. The "Form of a servant" which Christ took comprises "in toto" all the forms and is the source of all the categories which reason may legitimately use for its knowledge of God. Thus theology can only be pursued under the most intense mental activity in obedience to the Revelation of the Word of God in Jesus Christ, while the Incarnation means the proper delimitation of the sphere in which reason may operate for theological purposes, and at the same time it guarantees the validity of human categories as the proper analogies through which we may really know God.⁸⁹

⁸⁸Torrance, "The Character of Theological Thought," 28.

⁸⁹Torrance, "The Place and Function of Reason in Christian Theology," 41. Interestingly, in this early 21-page address, the name of Torrance's Basel supervisor, Karl Barth, does not appear. For a similar observation concerning another early publication by Torrance, *The Modern Theological Debate* (1941), see McPake, 288-291 and 370, n. 2. McPake persuasively argues for Barth's influence on the content of Torrance's writing, but credits Torrance's reticence to mention his obvious debt to Barth in this other early work to "the theologically conservative nature of the audience to which the lectures were addressed"--the Theological Students' Prayer Union of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship (McPake, 371, n. 3). While that rationale for Torrance's reticence might well account for the first case, it hardly applies to the New College Theological Society. Given the tense historical context in which the paper was delivered, could Torrance, in spite of his debt to Barth, not be striving for a uniquely Scottish development of these theological themes?

Thus, the person of Christ--more particularly his "form of a servant" or his incarnate form in human nature--provides the forms and categories for the work of Christ as revealer.⁹⁰

In mid-life, Torrance reiterates the importance of Christ's humanity for revelation and dogmatic reflection:

That is to say, it is in the obedient Humanity of Jesus Christ Himself that we are provided not only with the form of God's Revelation but with the true norm and pattern of all exposition of it.⁹¹

More broadly a few years later, Torrance concludes:

Thus dogmatic statements are not only correlated with God as Subject and correlated with one another in the collective subjectivity of the Church but are directed to Jesus as the centre of their correlation with God and man. . . . Thus here in the Object of dogmatic statements there is already included human subjectivity (i.e. subject-hood), so that it is the human nature of Jesus Christ that becomes the norm that we must use in determining the form of dogmatic statements as they are correlated to the human subject as well as correlated to the divine Subject.⁹²

As a norm, therefore, of theological reflection, Christ's human nature is not merely

⁹⁰Torrance, "Predestination in Christ," 131. This concern to see the hypostatic union in general and the humanity of Christ in particular as a model providing the categories of revelation and resulting dogmatics is repeated throughout Torrance's writings in the 1940's. See Torrance, Modern Theological Debate, 17; Torrance, "Predestination in Christ," 127, 129, 130, 141; Torrance, "The Place and Function of Reason in Christian Theology," 39; T. F. Torrance, Review of Towards a Christian Philosophy by Leonard Hodgson, in Evangelical Quarterly 15 (1943): 237-239; T. F. Torrance, Review of The Apostolic Ministry, ed. Kenneth E. Kirk, in Scottish Journal of Theology 1 (1948): 198; T. F. Torrance, "Faith and Philosophy," The Hibbard Journal 47 (1948-49): 243, 245; and T. F. Torrance, Review of Catholicity, in Scottish Journal of Theology 2 (1949): 87.

⁹¹Torrance, School of Faith, lxiii.

⁹²Torrance, Theological Science, 351.

instrumental but it is essential to his person and work.⁹³ Thus, the hypostatic union is used by Torrance dynamically as "a servant-category in the Christological correction of other doctrines," and this integration of Christ's person and work is quite clearly seen down through the decades in Torrance's doctrine of revelation.⁹⁴

Therefore, since the earliest days of his career, Torrance has been interested in the revelational implications of a more dynamic approach to the hypostatic union. But what of Torrance's doctrine of reconciliation--does it too display the marks of a more dynamic approach to the use of the hypostatic union? And if so, under what influences does Torrance develop this aspect of his theology?

In his 1939 Auburn Seminary lectures on christology, we can trace the initial development of Torrance's thought on reconciliation. As noted earlier, Torrance during this period is clearly searching for a way to bring together the person and work of Christ. With his quest unfolding before our eyes, the uniquely Scottish and British sources influencing his thought come more to light, inevitably helping shape the contours of the theology Torrance forges.

In his chapter headed "The Person and Work of Christ," the more conspicuous influence of the first volume of Barth's Church Dogmatics, which dominates his thoughts on revelation and is so visible earlier in the christology lectures, appears to

⁹³Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 56-57: "He does not mediate a revelation or a reconciliation that is other than what he is, as though he were only the agent or instrument of that mediation to mankind. He embodies what he mediates in himself, for what he mediates and what he is are one and the same. . . . If we let go of that inner constitutive identity between Jesus Christ and God, or between the Person and either the Word or Work of Christ, then our understanding of the Gospel begins to disintegrate and finally collapses altogether."

⁹⁴Torrance, School of Faith, lxii. See also Torrance, "The Hypostatic Union," 7.

fade.⁹⁵ We find ourselves apparently alone in the company of H. R. Mackintosh and Emil Brunner.⁹⁶

Mackintosh again sets the basic attitude with which the young Torrance approaches his topic: "His work is but His Person in movement."⁹⁷ Next, Torrance approvingly quotes Denney, who asserts that it is the doctrine of the atonement that makes a doctrine of Christ's person possible.⁹⁸ After citing Luther and Melanchthon to the same effect, however, Torrance quickly warns against taking this approach too far, as Ritschl had done.⁹⁹

So how does Torrance move forward? To proceed, he revisits the synthesis of God's being and acts on which he had lectured previously.¹⁰⁰ Returning to this theme,

⁹⁵Torrance does not make any reference to Barth's works in this chapter and, as far as I can tell, does not draw directly from them for the substance of his discussion.

⁹⁶Repeated citations are made to Mackintosh's The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ and especially Brunner's The Mediator. Every double spaced typed manuscript page makes reference or allusion to one of these two sources, and two references to Luther and Melanchthon are drawn from these modern sources as well. The only other sources Torrance mentions here are James Denney's The Death of Christ and John McLeod Campbell.

⁹⁷Mackintosh, 326; cited in Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 243. This quote opens chapter 11, "The Person and Work of Christ," in Torrance's Auburn christology lectures.

⁹⁸James Denney, The Death of Christ (New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1911), 318; cited in Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 243.

⁹⁹Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 243. Although not referenced, here Torrance draws the material on Luther and Melanchthon from Brunner, The Mediator, 407-408.

¹⁰⁰Torrance treated this theme earlier in his Auburn lectures when discussing the being of God. The new paragraph in Torrance's lecture begins on a retrospective note: "In our discussion of the Being of God we note that for us the Being of God was known only through His acts; the Being of God was God being Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to us; and what He was to us He was and is antecedently in Himself to all

he now repeats:

Thus the most important element in His action is His presence in act. His reality is His reality-in-act, and apart from act we do not know God at all. . . . God may be known thus in an act which is identical with His Person, that is an act in which He is present in the act which issues from His Being. That act we found to be Jesus Christ Himself, the act in which the act of God and His Person were identical. There in Christ God communicates not something but Himself. That is to say the work of God is not simply an instrument but a self-end.¹⁰¹

But to what use does Torrance put this theme drawn from his treatment of the being of God and revelation? At the start of the next paragraph of his lecture, Torrance answers our query:

Now this means that we are to think of Christ as the act of God identical with God's own Person. Christ Himself is identical in His existence with the operation of God for men's salvation--we are therefore to think of the Person and the work of Christ as one, that is, of the Act of God in Him for men's salvation as one with the Person of the Eternal Word Who became flesh in Jesus Christ. Christ is what He does.¹⁰²

What moves Torrance to this connection between revelation and reconciliation is clear: Torrance's Scottish context again pushes to the fore. The next sentence of the lecture is drawn from Mackintosh's christology:

Christ is what He does. Too often have the works of Christ in teaching or in Atonement been thought of in abstraction from His Person; His works issue from His Person and what Christ is in His acts on the Cross, He is in His own Person. He is perfectly what He does. He is in Himself what He reveals of

eternity. God may not be known as He is in Himself but only as He reveals Himself in action." Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 244. Observe here the same reticence by the young Torrance to read God as he is to us in Christ ad extra back onto the Godhead ad intra, which we noted earlier. See footnote 64 above.

¹⁰¹Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 244. Torrance is here alluding to the content of KD II/1, which he heard in Barth's Basel lectures in the winter and summer of 1938.

¹⁰²Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 245.

God the Father (Vide HRM. op. cit. p. 341).¹⁰³

After further quoting Mackintosh, Torrance draws the connection between the work of Christ and the hypostatic union:

What Christ does therefore in the flesh, what He speaks in words, what He does in life and death is what He is in Person, what God is and does for us-- thus in part the question of the Person and work of Christ is to be understood as the hypostatic union of the humanity and divinity in Christ; as the union of two natures in One, in one Mediator between Man and God who is both God and Man truly and perfectly in Himself.¹⁰⁴

Thus, reconciliation and atonement are not "a kind of transaction objective to Christ," but they are integral to Christ's person.¹⁰⁵

On this basis, Torrance then is ready to integrate the active and passive obedience of Christ in his person.¹⁰⁶ As an act-in-being of the person of Christ, Torrance infers that the work of the Cross began at Bethlehem:

This being so we are to think of the work of the Cross as beginning immediately [when] He was born and as increasing with his growth into Manhood, deepening in intensity as he entered the public Ministry. His whole life is His Passion; for His life represents the coming of the Son of God under the form of a servant and under the curse of the Law. The Passion begins when He identifies Himself with our sinful race and bears in Himself the assaults of evil. . . . His whole work lies in the Fact of His Sonship existing here under these human conditions. . . . His work and action lie in the fact that He

¹⁰³Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 245. Torrance is making reference to Mackintosh, 341.

¹⁰⁴Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ, 245.

¹⁰⁵Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 246. Torrance specifically identifies Anselm as having made this mistake, an idea which doubtless came from Brunner, The Mediator, 409.

¹⁰⁶Interestingly, at the beginning of this christology chapter next to the chapter title, Torrance added in longhand: "Discuss active and passive obedience of Christ--cf. work and Person: death and life" (Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 243). Could he be drawing in his concern from Brunner? See Brunner, The Mediator, 509-510.

as God is present in the world of men, present vicariously and in identification of Himself with the world in its conditions.¹⁰⁷

By incarnating, Christ identifies with us in person, which throughout his life is his great work. Christ's identification with humankind, then, precludes mere substitution:

But we cannot assert that He came simply to die and to carry out a transaction for men. We cannot rest content simply with a substitutionary view of the work and Person of Christ.¹⁰⁸

Thus, Torrance concludes:

And so Christ's Person, dynamic and not Static Person, is both God for us and God to us, both Person and Word, act which is identical with the very Person of God. The work of Christ coincides with His Person; His being with His vicarious suffering.¹⁰⁹

The chapter on the person and work of Christ then ends with a long quotation from Brunner, confirming Torrance's conclusion of the importance of this identification theme for the proper integration of Christ's person and work.¹¹⁰

While the typescript chapter 11 of the unpublished Auburn Seminary lectures on christology ends at this point, Torrance's labor on the topic does not. In longhand at the bottom of this last page of the chapter, he writes a note reminding himself how to further develop this topic:

In illustration of the Person and Work of our Lord compare the teaching of R.

¹⁰⁷Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 249. This is, to my knowledge, the earliest recorded use by Torrance of "vicarious" for Christ's whole life, not just his death on the cross or penitence before God for sins. Torrance appears to be drawing this broad use of the term from Brunner. See Brunner, The Mediator, 510.

¹⁰⁸Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 251.

¹⁰⁹Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 251.

¹¹⁰Brunner, The Mediator, 493-497; cited by Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 251-253.

W. Dale with that of McLeod Campbell on the Atonement.

1) R. W. Dale insists on the Work of Christ--in suffering as such--almost to the exclusion of his Person

2) McLeod Campbell insists on the spiritual attitude of Christ--on His Person of the Incarnation--with almost total exclusion of the work of suffering!

These two must both be held--the Person and the Work together as involving each other.¹¹¹

It did not take Torrance long to develop his longhand illustration for his students. In chapter 13 of the christology lectures, titled "The Mediation of Christ," he returns to Dale and Campbell, devoting most of the chapter to a discussion of their important contributions.¹¹² Thus, the influence of his native Scotland and Britain reaches, in these early christology lectures, its most visible zenith when treating the mediation and the related issues of Christ's person and work.

¹¹¹Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 253. The texts of these two authors from which Torrance is working are R. W. Dale, The Atonement: The Congregational Union Lecture for 1875 (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1878); and J. McLeod Campbell, The Nature of the Atonement and its Relation to Remission of Sins and Eternal Life (London: Macmillan and Co., 1915). R. W. Dale (1829-1895) was a Congregationalist leader and pastor of the Carr's Lane Congregational Church in Birmingham. See A. W. W. Dale, Life of R. W. Dale (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1899). For a broad but detailed work on Dale's Theology, see the article by Andrew Martin Fairbairn entitled "Dale as a Theologian" in Life of R. W. Dale. For other treatments on Dale's theory of the atonement, see J. K. Mozley, The Doctrine of the Atonement (London, Duckworth and Co., 1915), R. S. Franks, The Work of Christ: A Historical Study of Christian Doctrine (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1962), and L. W. Grensted, A Short History of the Doctrine of the Atonement (Manchester: The University Press, 1920). For a brief overview of the theology of John McLeod Campbell, see J. B. Torrance, Introduction to The Nature of the Atonement by J. McLeod Campbell (Edinburgh and Grand Rapids: Handsel Press and Eerdmans, 1995), 1-16; Michael Jenkins, Love is of the Essence (Edinburgh: St. Andrews Press, 1993), 1-29; and George M. Tuttle, So Rich a Soil: John McLeod Campbell on Christian Atonement (Edinburgh: Handsel Press, 1986). For a strikingly different assessment of Campbell, where Torrance defends Campbell against the charge of a diminished view of penalty, see Torrance, Scottish Theology, 287-317, especially 308-310.

¹¹²Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 268-286.

Torrance opens this chapter, as was often his habit, recapping the gist of the last chapters:

In our discussion of the Person and work of Christ we learned that Christ is to be understood functionally and not metaphysically; His Person is not static but dynamic; it does not stand but works; and it is His Being that is His great act and all other acts are to be understood from that primary act of the Incarnation when He assumed the form of His Person on earth in union with Man.¹¹³

What does this approach to the person and work mean for the Cross?

The Cross of Golgotha thus represents in view a cross-section of the living Person of Christ in action. There in His suffering the constitution of His Person is opened to the view of saving faith. At the cross we see the 'strands' which make up the Person of Christ; and understanding through what He did for us what those 'strands' mean for us.¹¹⁴

The gist of chapter 12, "The Background of the Cross," is also summarized by

Torrance:

Then we went on to think of the background of the Cross, itself the shadow revealed by the Cross as it revealed the sin of man for whom Christ died. In discussion of the nature of sin we saw that it had a double constitution; on one hand it was an act of man in rebellion to the will and nature of God; on the other hand that rebellion was qualified by the act of divine resistance or wrath which turned out to be an ultimate factor in the constitution of sin, because if God did not resist sin, there would be no difference between good and evil or rather faith and sin; and therefore no sin at all. We further saw that sin is closely connected with death, for sin goes back not simply to an act but to the nature of man to his human existence; sin being the perversion of that nature is suicide, and results in death.¹¹⁵

¹¹³Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 263.

¹¹⁴Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 268. In the margin, Torrance writes: "see Denney, Reconciliation, p. 16f."

¹¹⁵Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 268. The "double constitution" of sin in the previous chapter is drawn primarily from chapter 5 of Brunner's The Mediator, titled "The Depth of the Distinction: The Interpretation of the Problem of Evil." See Brunner, 122-152, especially 139ff. Here Torrance's presentation also references from Barth's CD I/1, 407ff; Alexander Maclaren, Matthew, vol. 3, 349; and P. T. Forsyth, The Work of Christ, 85.

Torrance is here concerned to bring "both of these pairs of facts" or "strands" to bear in his understanding of the person of Christ: both the act of man and the act of God.¹¹⁶

To introduce these two strands of christological analysis, Torrance uses the views of R. W. Dale and John McLeod Campbell as foils:

In Dale's view we have the work of Christ stressed rather than the Person and attitude of Christ in the Incarnation - though it is not without an emphasis on that side too. In Campbell we have, on the other hand, the attitude of Christ stressed so much that the death of Christ as a suffering seems to have been lost sight of. The actual work of Christ is subordinated to His Person.¹¹⁷

Torrance does not attempt to balance these two British nineteenth-century theologies over against one another as much as to look for dogmatic themes in each to appropriate in his own developing thought:

We shall have to take both these aspects into account; and it is not a matter of drawing a balance between the two as to get the right view of both. On the whole, it is Dale that is nearer the truth; though we have an emphasis in McLeod Campbell that we cannot allow to be omitted.¹¹⁸

How, then, does Torrance decide which theological themes to appropriate from Dale and Campbell? His previously derived double nature of sin controls his thinking:

We must take both sides into our understanding because of the double nature of sin already discussed. Just because the situation is such must we understand the work of Christ in terms of a Mediation in which He handles both the human side and the divine; sin and the divine wrath against it; and to these correspond the Character and the work of Christ.¹¹⁹

And how does Torrance draw out this double-natured relation between sin and

¹¹⁶Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 268.

¹¹⁷Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 269.

¹¹⁸Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 269.

¹¹⁹Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 269.

salvation?

If sin is qualified as sin by the attitude of God, then it is the attitude of God that must be mediated and reconciled in the death of Christ and stressed accordingly. If sin is an act of man going down into the roots of his nature and bringing death--sin being the contradiction into which the creature has fallen in respect of his own being--then the work of Christ from the side of the Creature must be stressed.¹²⁰

Finally, Torrance combines these two themes in his treatment:

These two sides are maintained and executed in Christ's Person which is Divine and His work which is in the flesh, though going back to a divine act which willed to assume such flesh and this flesh which is crucified for the world. That is to say, here in the Cross we see Christ in the Person of the Mediator in which His Person or attitude and His Work are one. His work is just in His Person through His work to bring about that Oneness of mind between Man and God which constitutes an act and state of reconciliation.¹²¹

Torrance develops this two-side work of Christ theme for the rest of chapter 13 under separate headings: "The Act of God in Christ for God" and "The Act of Christ with God on Behalf of Man."¹²² Although not specified in the lecture, these section titles for Torrance's two strands of christological analysis are clearly drawn from John McLeod Campbell's The Nature of the Atonement.¹²³

¹²⁰Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 269.

¹²¹Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 269-270.

¹²²Torrance first introduces the two section titles (Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 271). Then the first section is treated (Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 272-278), followed by the second (Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 278-286).

¹²³Campbell divides chapter 6 of his work into two sections: "Christ's dealing with God on the part of men" and "Christ's dealing with God on behalf of men" (Campbell, vii, 111, 115). Torrance draws from these sections in Campbell a number of times in his chapter, as will be seen. Note that Torrance is not merely expounding Campbell; in fact, Torrance corrects Campbell at a number of key points. Torrance is, however, weaving his own positive theology using these two strands of christological analysis, which he develops from Mackintosh, Brunner, Campbell, and others. Campbell

Under the first heading, Torrance expounds the love and holiness of God in the face of man's sin. Christ comes to vindicate the divine name on the cross. In so doing, he "identifies Himself with our sin":

Luther in very bold language actually talks of Christ as a sinner. . . . We are not to think of this identification of Christ with sin as a legal fiction; or as a forensic matter merely, though it is that also; but as an actual fact; just as it is and will be an actual fact that we are made righteous in Christ.¹²⁴

Reflecting on the forensic aspect of the atonement, Torrance continues:

We cannot really get away from a penal view of the death of Christ. McLeod Campbell is always trying to ward off a penal interpretation of the death of Christ, but he maintains with real vigor the wrath of God. . . . Campbell is quite right in pointing out that there is a suffering in God which is not to be penally interpreted. . . . What McLeod Campbell did not understand was that it is just this wounded love that must react, if it is to be love, in punishment; not for the sake of punishment but for the sake of God.¹²⁵

Thus, Torrance's appropriation of Campbell in this strand of christological analysis is not uncritical but constructive.

Under the second heading, "The Act of Christ on Behalf of Man," Torrance points to F. D. Maurice as championing this theme:

It is Maurice that makes the representation of Christ the main element in his

provides the titles and some of the theological content of Torrance's positive development. Quite recently, Torrance again highlights these two strands in Campbell, links them to Athanasius' Contra Arianos IV.6, and implies that Campbell must have been following Athanasius in this teaching (Torrance, Scottish Theology, 301).

¹²⁴Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 276. Campbell draws attention to Luther's "the one sinner" in reference to Christ (Campbell, 125).

¹²⁵Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 276-277. Torrance's critique of Campbell is drawn from Dale, 424-425. In this section of his argument, Torrance is correcting Campbell's exegesis of Psalm 119:136. Compare with Campbell, 114. For a similar but rare critique of Campbell by Torrance in his published record, see Torrance, "The Place of the Humanity of Christ in the Sacramental Life of the Church," 8.

interpretation of the Atonement. But while it is an essential part it cannot stand alone at all, for the act of Christ here on behalf of man is ultimately an act of God from the human side; for it is The Word who assumes Human form in order so to act. Thus the divine side is bound up with the representative side of the Cross and cannot be separated from it.¹²⁶

Torrance discusses the theological rationale of Christ's representation of humankind in terms of the imago Dei. As the image of God, man is related to God.

Now this relation to the Father is a relation through Christ. It was through Christ the Word that we were all created; it is in Christ that all creatures consist and have their being; it is in the image of Christ that all men were made.¹²⁷

To make this point all the more clearly, Torrance reiterates in more detail:

That is to say, our very being as human creatures is bound up with the Word or Son of God. . . . Our existence as persons consists in Him; and He comes to us now in our own form in order to restore the form which has been lost in us; I speak here of the essential form in which humanity consists in the Image of God, not of the outward form which is the visible mark of man, though of course Christ did assume that form too. But Christ comes as a brother; that is as a fellow-man, though as God. He comes as the head and creator of our race in whom we all consist. Thus He comes, in virtue of the fact that He has become man, as one of us; and not simply as one man among others, but as the

¹²⁶Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 278. Torrance is drawing from Dale's treatment of Maurice (Dale, 404) and may be also drawing from Mackintosh, who mentions Maurice in passing along these lines (Mackintosh, 276). J. F. D. Maurice (1805-1872) was a Church of England theologian and the Knightbridge professor of casuistry, moral theology, and moral philosophy at Cambridge. On Maurice's theology of Christ's representation and identification with the whole human race, see David Young, F. D. Maurice and Unitarianism (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 207-215; Torben Christensen, The Divine Order: A Study in F. D. Maurice's Theology (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973), 185-196; and Alec R. Vidler, The Theology of F. D. Maurice (London: SCM Press, 1948), 35-63, especially 41-46. Vidler notes that Maurice is similar to John McLeod Campbell in that human will may in some way thwart God's universal divine intent in the person of Christ and reap condemnation. Thus, Maurice is not strictly speaking a universalist (Vidler, 61). For the profound Scottish influences on Maurice, especially Thomas Erskine of Linlathen, Edward Irving, John McLeod Campbell, and Alexander John Scott, see Young, 130-133.

¹²⁷Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 279. Torrance here also relates his treatment of the imago Dei to the personification of "wisdom" in the Old Testament Wisdom literature.

only one who can actually represent all men for all men consist in Him. Thus He comes as the proper Man as Luther called Him, as the Head of our race, as our representative before God and man. It is thus that Christ takes upon Himself in a voluntary act the sons of man and bears them before God; it is thus that He becomes our High-Priest, and makes a sacrifice to God which is none other than Himself, in an expiation which satisfies the Majesty of God; in an act which represents all humanity and covers each individual case in an objective atonement.¹²⁸

¹²⁸Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 279-280. The reference to Luther is from his hymn "Ein feste Berg ist unser Gott" (Martin Luther, D. Martin Luthers Werke, vol. 35, Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Weimarer Ausgabe [Weimar: Hermann Böhlhaus Nachfolger, 1923; reprinted Graz: Akademische Druke und Verlagsanstalt, 1964], 455-456), but as translated by Thomas Carlyle (Martin Luther, "A Safe Stronghold Our God is Still," trans. Thomas Carlyle, Church Hymnary, ed. James Moffatt, 2nd revised edition (London: Oxford University Press, 1928), 637. The American translation of this same hymn is perhaps better known: "A Mighty Fortress is Our God." The word "proper" can mean "fitting," or it can mean "utter," "absolute," or "complete" (compare Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, [Springfield, MA: G. & C. Merriam, 1977], 923; and The Oxford English Dictionary, vol. 8 [Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1970], 1469-1470). In the Scottish milieu, a "proper man" has definite connotations: one "acting in his own person as distinct from that delegated to him by a deputy" (Scottish National Dictionary, 260). This concept was not unknown, obviously, to Thomas Carlyle: see Thomas Carlyle, "Hero as Priest: Luther, Reformation, Knox, Puritanism," in Heroes and Hero-Worship, vol. 14 of The Works of Thomas Carlyle, Centennial Memorial Edition (Boston: Dana Estes & Company, 1892), 341-377. On Thomas Carlyle, "Scotland's greatest Victorian," see Ian Campbell, "Thomas Carlyle," Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology, ed. Cameron, 137-138. Are Carlyle and Torrance not here using a powerful play on words? I am indebted to Dr. Ian Campbell of the University of Edinburgh Scottish History Department for his kind assistance on this matter. Torrance also uses Luther's "proper man" in theological argument elsewhere. For this allusion elsewhere in the Auburn Seminary lectures, see Torrance, "The Character of Theological Thought," 26. In his New College lectures, Torrance echoes his 1939 treatment of the subject with few modifications (T. F. Torrance, "Atoning Justification," New College Lectures, personal collection of T. F. Torrance, 14). While John McLeod Campbell treats Luther, this phrase is not in his work. What other sources might lie behind this pregnant paragraph? Torrance appears to be drawing quite extensively from Dale's tenth lecture, "The Theory of the Atonement Illustrated by the Relation of our Lord Jesus Christ to the Human Race," which treats Maurice (Dale, 399-440, especially 402, 433). Torrance may also be drawing from Mackintosh's synopsis of Maurice (Mackintosh, 276). No references are given for other sources Torrance might be using here, although New College's H. A. A. Kennedy strikes a similar note when dealing with "The Cosmic Relations of Christ" in a work cited previously in these lectures (H. A. A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles [London: Duckworth and Company,

Him which results in a real death.¹³¹

Torrance goes on to stress that physical death flows from the separation of God from our persons due to sin, and, therefore, Christ's death on the cross "lies at the bottom of the atonement."¹³² Torrance again critiques Campbell:

That whole side is really omitted by Campbell precisely because he doesn't understand the depths of sin. We find in the death of Christ not only perfect confession but perfect submission and the acknowledgement that we deserve to die and suffer for sin.¹³³

Thus, at the end of his treatment, Torrance synthesizes themes or strands of christological analysis from both Dale and Campbell in his theological tapestry.¹³⁴

Here, then, we have seen an overview of Torrance's early development of the implications for reconciliation flowing from his more dynamic approach to the Chalcedonian christology. It is clear that the young T. F. Torrance is not just Karl

¹³¹Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 282. Torrance's comments about Athanasius understanding the importance of corruption do not appear to derive from sustained study of primary Athanasian texts at this point. It appears that for this lecture, this passing comment about Athanasius is taken from Brunner (Brunner, The Mediator, 491, n. 1).

¹³²Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 282. Torrance then again quotes Dale to correct Campbell's limiting of atonement to Christ's confession. See Dale, 482f.

¹³³Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 282-283. At the bottom of page 282, Torrance writes in longhand: "He [Campbell] doesn't understand that the idea of sacrifice depends on the actuality of it. Cf. my note in Mediator, p. 484."

¹³⁴Torrance ends the chapter reflecting, in light of his work on Dale and Campbell, on Anselm's debt metaphor for the atonement and the priestly metaphor, apparently drawn from Hebrews. Here Torrance is again following Brunner, The Mediator, 501. On Anselm's work, Torrance concludes: "Cur Deus Homo? The point which we must note in that exposition here is that Christ in His relation to men as their representative makes that perfect satisfaction before God as only He can do it. As Man by His perfect obedience toward God He bursts through the hermetically closed relations between God and man, and opens up the way to the Father through the sacrifice of Himself." Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 282-284.

Barth with a Scottish accent. Indeed, a number of uniquely Scottish and British sources--as well as Barth's sometime friend and nemesis, Emil Brunner--have profoundly shaped the issues with which Torrance wrestled and his approach to them. They set many of the burning theological questions in his mind and provided no small amount of the substance for his answers. To be sure, Torrance draws extensively from Barth and turns to him both overtly and covertly, especially on the topic of revelation. However, the framework of Torrance's thinking on the person and work of Christ was decidedly native, and his debt to Brunner was substantial.

It is clear, however, this christological topic was one to which Torrance intended to return. On top of this chapter in longhand is written: "This chapter is very badly thought out--must be done over!"¹³⁵ Torrance spent the rest of his career doing precisely that: revisiting the mediation of Christ. But as we shall see later, while some modification, especially in the historical presentation and terminology, occurs through the years, the basic thrust of Torrance's early thought does not.

Torrance's early interest in uniting the person and work of Christ eventually comes into a more succinct, mature form. In his book, The Mediation of Christ, Torrance summarizes his mature development of the person and work of Christ:

He constitutes in his own incarnate Person the content and the reality of what he mediates It is this identity between Mediation and Mediator in Jesus Christ who is God and man in his one indivisible Person that is so supremely important for us to grasp and hold on to, for the very essence of the Gospel is bound up with it.¹³⁶

Thus, while this integration of Christ's person and work is fundamental in Torrance's

¹³⁵Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 268.

¹³⁶Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 56-57.

thought, transcending his commitment to the Chalcedonian definition *simpliciter*, it has one foot on uniquely Scottish soil.

Post-Chalcedonian Christology

T. F. Torrance's "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ" in his New College lectures does not end with the homousion of Nicea and the hypostatic union of Chalcedon, dynamically conceived as a disclosure model. On the contrary, the most fascinating contours of Torrance's christology are developed from what lies ahead on the time line of historical theology.

Torrance next moves to Post-Chalcedonian christology.¹³⁷ Here another cognitive instrument is identified for developing theology: the Post-Chalcedonian patristic doctrine of the anhypostatic-enhypostatic nature of Christ's humanity.¹³⁸

If the Chalcedonian formulation of the doctrine of Christ is to be regarded as a theological disclosure-model, the doctrine of anhypostasis and enhypostasis may be regarded as another cognitive instrument, a piece of 'theological algebra' used to bring out the distinctive kind of connection latent in the 'economic condescension' of God in and through the Incarnation, in which all of grace (pure transcendent act of God) does not mean in any way the overpowering or elimination of the human, but precisely the opposite: its affirmation and rehabilitation as such and therefore its freedom and integrity before God.¹³⁹

Elsewhere Torrance also says of this theological model:

A striking example of this 'theological algebra' is the compound conception of

¹³⁷Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 2-3.

¹³⁸Anhypostatos and enhypostatos are two Post-Chalcedonian terms developed to express the relationship of Christ's human and divine natures. Their exact meaning, as well as that of the theological terms developed from them, will become apparent in our unfolding discussion.

¹³⁹Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 3.

anhypostasia and *enhypostasia* which, taken together with the doctrine of the hypostatic union, serves to bring out the essential logic of Grace and logic of Christ, not only in our understanding of Christ Himself but in the other doctrines that are organized round the Incarnation as their centre of reference. Used in this way the conception of *anhypostasia* and *enhypostasia* is remarkably fertile in its power to throw light on many difficulties and to reveal the true form in which many relations are to be conceived.¹⁴⁰

Clearly, this piece of theological algebra has implications for much of Torrance's wider dogmatic thought.

The importance of this anhypostatic-enhypostatic conception of Christ's human nature for Torrance's theology can hardly be overstated.¹⁴¹ Trook has perceptively described it--albeit with his typical scientific zeal--as "the atomic structure" of Torrance's thought:

Although the importance of the doctrine of the anhypostasis-enhypostasis is not nearly as textually visible in Torrance's writing, it may not, in fact, be too much to contend, that as our Christological magnification increases, it emerges as the atomic structure of his thought.¹⁴²

Trook is entirely correct in noting that Torrance's use of this theological formula is somewhat hidden in the background of his published writings, but in recent years Torrance has thrust this theme more to the fore.¹⁴³ The central importance of this

¹⁴⁰Torrance, Theological Science, 269.

¹⁴¹Colyer notes of this theological couplet: "its importance in his theology should not be underestimated" (Colyer, 292, n. 58). Torrance himself notes: "In this way, the anhypostatic-enhypostatic relation has application beyond Christology itself to soteriology and ecclesiology, etc" (Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 3).

¹⁴²Trook, 85-86.

¹⁴³At the time of Trook's writing, Torrance had mentioned this couplet on only four separate occasions in his extensive printed corpus, aside from reprints: Torrance, "Atonement and Oneness of the Church," 249-252, 256; T. F. Torrance, "Introduction: The Place of Christology in Biblical and Dogmatic Theology," in Essays in Christology for Karl Barth, ed. T. H. L. Parker (London: Lutterworth Press, 1956), 16-17, 37;

couplet was long evident, however, in Torrance's unpublished New College lectures.¹⁴⁴

Before discussing Torrance's precise formulation of this patristic couplet, a brief treatment of the linguistic background is helpful. The term anhypostatos was used by the fathers, and its cognates are defined by standard lexicographers as "without sure foundation," "immaterial," "unsubstantial," "without independent existence," and "imaginary."¹⁴⁵ The term anhypostatos was also used by the later

Torrance, Theological Science, 217, 269; Torrance, Space, Time and Resurrection, 51, 53, 55, 95. In recent years, however, Torrance has begun more openly highlighting its importance for his thought: T. F. Torrance, "My Interaction with Karl Barth," in How Karl Barth Changed My Mind, ed. Donald K. McKim (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 55; T. F. Torrance, "Karl Barth and Patristic Theology," in Theology Beyond Christendom, ed. John Thompson (Allison Park, PA: Pickwick Publications, 1986), 199-201; Torrance, Trinitarian Faith, 131, 208, 221, 222, 226, 230, 233, 244, 245, 324, 327, 328, 330, 331, 340; T. F. Torrance, "Incarnation and Atonement: Theosis and Henosis in the light of modern scientific rejection of dualism," address to the New College Student Theological Society, 8 October 1991, 4; Torrance, "The Atonement--The Singularity of Christ and the Finality of the Cross: The Atonement and the Moral Order," 230; and Torrance, The Christian Doctrine of God, One Being Three Persons, 144, 160. Published occurrences of the couplet are limited and not highly explanatory, although the conclusions drawn from it can be sweeping.

¹⁴⁴Torrance's New College lectures include prominent and significant treatments of the anhypostatic-enhypostatic couplet: Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 3; Torrance, "The Continuous Union in the Historical Life and Obedience of Jesus," 1; Torrance, "The Patristic Doctrine of Christ," 1, 6, 8; Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 8-10; and Torrance, "Atoning Justification," 12. Whereas his published comments on the couplet do not explain it in depth, here Torrance defines and applies the concept in detail. In addition, Torrance develops his theology in light of anhypostasia and enhypostasia, calling each half of this theological couplet a "rubric" under which christology may be organized and developed (Torrance, "The Continuous Union in the Historical Life and Obedience of Jesus," 1). While the terms anhypostasia and enhypostasia are not specifically treated in Torrance's Auburn Seminary lectures, whether or not the meaning Torrance attaches to them is present in these early lectures will have to be judged a posteriori, after our examination of this couplet in the rest of his corpus.

¹⁴⁵G. W. H. Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1978), 164. Also cited by John Macquarrie, "Anhypostasia and Enhypostasia: Two Elusive Concepts," presented at the 14th International Conference on Patristic Studies,

fathers, and its cognates are defined as "having independent existence" or "existing in an hypostasis."¹⁴⁶ The two theological terms anhypostasia and enhypostasia spring from the tendency of the church to develop abstractions:

These terms were invented by later generations of theologians, and they are very convenient. . . . Although the actual language of anhypostasia and enhypostasia is a later development, the ideas themselves are already there in older writers, but are expressed in a variety of concrete forms.¹⁴⁷

Not strictly parallel forms, Macquarrie notes, anhypostasia employs the negative adverb an- to mean "not hypostatic" or "not having a human hypostasis or (human) person", whereas enhypostasia employs the preposition en- as a prefix to mean "to be 'in' a hypostasis or person."¹⁴⁸ Thus, Torrance mainly uses anhypostasia and enhypostasia as dogmatic terms, and anhypostatic and enhypostatic are the corresponding adjectival forms. Torrance also uses on occasion the patristic terms anhypostatos and enhypostatos in his discussion in one context or another.

When tracing the patristic roots of this distinctive theological couplet, Torrance

Oxford, 19-23 August 1991.

¹⁴⁶Lampe, 485-486. Also cited by Macquarrie, 4-5.

¹⁴⁷Macquarrie, 1. Macquarrie credits Bishop Kallistos Ware with the idea that abstraction lay behind the development of these technical terms. For early church usage of these terms, see Johannes Caspari Suiceri, Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus, E Patribus Graecis Ordine Alphabetico, vol. 1 (Amsterdam: R. & J. Wetstenious and Gul. Smith, 1728), 395, 1127.

¹⁴⁸Macquarrie, "Anhypostasia and Enhypostasia," 7. Daley now disputes this definition for Leontius of Byzantium, claiming that the prefix in enhypostasis is not prepositional but the opposite of an alpha private (see Brian E. Daley, "'A Richer Union': Leontius of Byzantium and the Relationship of Human and Divine in Christ," a paper presented to the 14th International Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford, 19-23 August 1991).

points to Cyril of Alexandria, Severus of Antioch, and John of Damascus.¹⁴⁹ In his New College lectures, he also assigns a prominent role in the development of enhypostasis to Leontius of Byzantium.¹⁵⁰ However, the contribution of this shadowy patristic figure to the development of enhypostasia is now disputed.¹⁵¹ Muller

¹⁴⁹"However, a henotic or unitary understanding of the incarnation was given powerful expression by Cyril of Alexandria in his insistence that in the union of divine and human natures in Christ there is only one indivisible divine-human reality (**mia physis**), and in his illuminating use of the theological couplet **anhypostasis** and **enhypostasis** which was carried forward by Severus of Antioch and John of Damascus, picked up at the Reformation, and has played such a significant role in the teaching of Karl Barth in our day" (Torrance, "Incarnation and Atonement: Theosis and Henosis in the light of modern scientific rejection of dualism," 4).

¹⁵⁰"... in the sixth century the teaching of Leontius of Byzantium ... played an important part in the history of Christology, mainly through his work against Nestorians and Eutychians. As against the doctrine of the anhypostatic manhood attributed to Cyril of Alexandria, Leontius taught the doctrine of the enhypostatic Manhood of Christ. He repudiated the idea held by extreme Antiochenes that the human nature of Christ had an independent hypostasis, or independent centre of subsistence, but he taught that the true humanity of Christ was given full place within the hypostasis of the Son" (Torrance, "The Patristic Doctrine of Christ," 8). Trook concentrates on this background to the couplet (see Trook, 78-82). Both Torrance and Trook appear to be following a particular school of Leontian interpretation, sparked by the historical research of Friedrich A. Loofs (1858-1928) into the writings of Leontius of Byzantium. See Friedrich Loofs, Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1887), 67-68; Adolf von Harnack, History of Dogma IV, trans. Neil Buchanan (New York: 1961), 232-240; and H. M. Relton, A Study in Christology: The Problem of the Relation of the Two Natures in the Person of Christ (London: SPCK, 1917), 69-93.

¹⁵¹Leontius of Byzantium (?-543), originally from Constantinople, was apparently a committed dyophysite as a youth, and later in life became active in post-Chalcedonian christological debate. The details of his life and theology are points of ongoing contention among scholars, as is the precise identification of his corpus among the variety of writings attributed to "Leontius." For a summary of the biographical information available on Leontius of Byzantium, see L. Perrone, "Leontius of Byzantium," Encyclopedia of the Early Church, vol. 1, ed. Angelo D. Berardino, trans. Adrian Walford (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 480-481; Aloys Grillmeier, Christ in Christian Tradition, trans. John Cawte and Pauline Allen, vol. 2, pt. 2 (London: Mowbray, 1995), 181-228; and Brian Daley, "The Origenism of Leontius of Byzantium," Journal of Theological Studies, new series, 27 (1976): 333-

succinctly describes the entrance of this patristic teaching into Protestant theology:

The language of *anhypostasia* and *enhypostasia* was brought over into Western Christology by the translation of the Damascene's *De fide orthodoxa* in 1150 by John Burgundio of Pisa at the instance of Pope Eugenius III. The essentially Aristotelian philosophical perspective of the work, together with John's division of the treatise into four books, made the work of considerable usefulness to the scholastic writers of the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries These post-Chalcedonian boundaries of debate were inherited by the Reformers and their scholastic or orthodox successors.¹⁵²

This patristic and medieval heritage should not, however, cause us to lose sight of Torrance's own appropriation of this couplet. Torrance's knowledge of *anhypostasia* and *enhypostasia* should perhaps first be traced to his former New

369. For a critical edition of Leontius' works, see Brian E. Daley, "Leontius of Byzantium: A Critical Edition of His Works, with Prolegomena," (Ph.D. diss., University of Oxford, 1978). On Leontius' doctrine of the hypostatic union and enhypostasis, see Grillmeier, 193-200; Brian E. Daley, "'A Richer Union': Leontius of Byzantium and the Relationship of Human and Divine in Christ"; Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition*, vol. 1 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), 272, 336, 341; and John Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought* (Washington, DC: Corpus Books, 1969), 43-49. Perhaps for Torrance the question of Leontius' possible contribution to *enhypostasia* was overshadowed by his son's work on Severus of Antioch: Iain R. Torrance, *Christology after Chalcedon: Severus of Antioch and Sergius the Monophysite* (Norwich: The Canterbury Press Norwich, 1988).

¹⁵²Richard A. Muller, "Directions in the Study of Barth's Christology," *Westminster Theological Journal* 48 (1986): 126. Muller's intent is to show that Barth's usage of the couplet has more to do with debates among Lutheran and Reformed scholastics than with the patristic roots of the concept. Bruce Marshall confirms this understanding of the history of this ancient couplet: "In medieval scholasticism after the middle of the thirteenth century, the typical position is affirmed with varying degrees of clarity (especially when, as with Thomas Aquinas, John of Damascus is known in translation), but the terminology is absent (cf., e.g., III, 2, 2, ad3). Only in Protestant scholasticism, it seems, is the typical position, together with the by now ancient terminology, affirmed for the first time in the West." Bruce Marshall, *Christology in Conflict: The Identity of a Saviour in Rahner and Barth* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987), 194-195, n. 33. On the work of Burgundio of Pisa, see J. N. D. Kelly, *The Oxford Dictionary of Popes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 173; and Introduction, *Saint John of Damascus: Writings* by John of Damascus, trans. Frederic H. Chase, Jr., in *The Fathers of the Church* series, ed. Bernard M. Peebles, et. al. (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1970), xxxvi.

College professors, H. R. Mackintosh and G. T. Thomson¹⁵³. Also, Torrance was familiar with some of the issues surrounding the couplet from Brunner's The Mediator, which he used extensively in his Auburn Seminary lectures.¹⁵⁴ Doubtless, Torrance's early interest in the couplet would also have been stirred by D. M. Baillie's historical and critical remarks on the subject.¹⁵⁵

Above all, however, Torrance's attention to and understanding of the ancient anhypostatic-enhypostatic couplet was set by his Basel mentor, Karl Barth:

My studies in Basel were interrupted first by a year teaching theology at Auburn, New York But that gave me the opportunity to think through all that I had learned and was still learning from Barth and to put it to the test in writing and delivering lectures on the whole corpus of Christian doctrine, at which I struggled day and night in order to get ready in time for my classes. *Church Dogmatics* I/2 absorbed me In particular I was gripped by the way in which he resurrected and deployed the theological couplet *anhypostasia* and *enhypostasia* to throw into sharp focus "the inner logic of grace" (as I called it) embodied in the incarnation, with reference to which, not least as it had taken paradigmatic shape in the Virgin Birth of Jesus, all the ways and works of God in his interaction with us in space and time may be given careful formulation. . . . My own appreciation of this double concept confirmed and

¹⁵³Torrance was exposed to the theological couplet by both Mackintosh and Thomson. Mackintosh discussed the couplet in his New College lectures and wrote on the subject (Mackintosh, The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ, 205-209, 217-222). Thomson translated H. Heppe's Reformierte Dogmatik (1861) and used it in his theology classes at New College (D. F. Wright, "George Thomas Thomson," in Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology, ed. N. M. de S. Cameron, D. F. Wright, D. C. Lachman, and D. E. Meek [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993], 821). Heppe quotes from Alsted, the Leiden Synopsis, Heidegger, Mastricht, Polan, and a Diest when treating *anhypostasia* and *enhypostasia* (H. Heppe, Reformed Dogmatics, trans. G. T. Thomson [London: George Allen & Unwin, 1950], 417-418, 428-429, 435). For an overview of the British development of this couplet, see Hendry, 84-88.

¹⁵⁴While not using the terms anhypostasis and enhypostasis, Brunner does address the issue of whether or not Christ assumed a human personality (Brunner, The Mediator, 317-318). Torrance quotes this section of Brunner in his Auburn Seminary lectures (Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 206-208).

¹⁵⁵D. M. Baillie, God Was in Christ (London: Faber and Faber, 1948) 15-20, 85-93.

deepened my determination to work out more fully the scientific substructure of Christian dogmatics.¹⁵⁶

The vital importance of the anhypostatic-enhypostatic couplet for Barth's theology has been examined in detail by Bruce L. McCormack in his seminal work on Barth's early theological development.¹⁵⁷ The significance of this theological couplet for Barth as he deployed it in his theology was profound:

With the adoption of the anhypostatic-enhypostatic model of Christology, Barth's theology had moved into a new phase. The anhypostatic-enhypostatic model had supplanted the time-eternity dialectic as the central parable for expressing the *Realdialektik* of God's veiling and unveiling.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁶Torrance, "My Interaction with Karl Barth," 55. In the opening footnote to his introductory essay to a 1956 Barth Festschrift volume, Torrance also expresses his debt to Barth's Church Dogmatics I/2. This essay was one of Torrance's earliest treatments in print of anhypostasia and enhypostasia. See Torrance, "Introduction: The Place of Christology in Biblical and Dogmatic Theology," 13, n. 1.

¹⁵⁷In his Princeton dissertation, McCormack traces the origin and usefulness of this couplet in Barth's thought (Bruce L. McCormack, "A Scholastic of a Higher Order: The Development of Karl Barth's Theology, 1921-31" [Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1989], 316-336). For the much expanded, published version of this fine study, see Bruce L. McCormack, Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectic Theology: Its Genesis and Development, 1909-1936 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 358-367. McCormack's study corrects a school of Barth interpretation that attempts to locate "the point where 'dialectical thinking' gave way to 'analogical thinking'" in Barth's thinking. Torrance is a prominent member of this school (McCormack, Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectic Theology, vii-viii). For an earlier but more limited study of this important patristic couplet in Barth, see Marshall, 172-176.

¹⁵⁸McCormack, Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology, 367. McCormack details four consequences of this move by Barth. First, "the dialectic of veiling and unveiling had now been localized in the incarnation as a whole, and not just in the event of the cross. Second, he could now affirm the presence of the second Person of the Trinity in history, as a Subject who enters fully into the contradiction of human existence and overcomes it, without fear of historicizing revelation. . . . Third, the Adam-Christ dialectic was no longer seen as an eternal dialectic as in *Romans* II. It is a dialectic which is rooted and grounded in history . . . [and] he was now able to distinguish more carefully between reconciliation (as a historical event) and redemption (as an eschatological event). . . . Fourth, he could now appeal to the incarnation as the ground and prototype of the *analogia fidei*" (McCormack, Karl Barth's Critically

McCormack further notes that Heinrich Heppe and Heinrich Schmid introduced Barth to this ancient patristic couplet.¹⁵⁹

But what did Torrance understand this theological couplet to mean, and how did he use it to develop his theology? In his first published treatment of the subject in 1954, Torrance clearly describes the two terms we are considering. The human nature of Christ is anhypostatic:

By *anhypostasia* classic Christology asserted that in the *assumptio carnis* the human nature of Christ had not independent *per se* subsistence apart from the event of the Incarnation, apart from the hypostatic union.¹⁶⁰

Thus, the adoptionistic heresy is avoided by use of this term. The human nature of Christ is also enhypostatic:

Realistic Dialectical Theology, 366-367).

¹⁵⁹Heppe's Reformierte Dogmatic (1861) and Schmid's Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche (1858) were the "sources from which Barth had learned of this theologoumenon . . ." (McCormack, Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology, 361-362). Marshall confirms Barth's dependence upon these two sources for his knowledge of the couplet, adding: "It is retained, with no basic change in definition, in the *Church Dogmatics*" (Marshall, 194, n. 32). For Barth's use of this theological couplet, see Karl Barth, The Göttingen Dogmatics: Instruction in the Christian Religion, ed. Hannelotte Reiffen, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 157, 163; Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics I/2, ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, trans. G. W. Bromiley and G. T. Thomson (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956), 20-21, 136, 147-148, 163-165, 193; Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics III/2, ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, trans. H. Knight, J. K. S. Reid, G. W. Bromiley and R. H. Fuller (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1960), 70; and Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics IV/2, ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, trans. G. W. Bromiley (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1958), 49-51, 91-92.

¹⁶⁰Torrance, "Atonement and the Oneness of the Church," 249. For this definition, Torrance's debt to Barth or Barth's own source is obvious (compare with Barth, Church Dogmatics I/2, 162-165; and Heppe, 417-418, 428-429, 435). Torrance returns to this description of *anhypostasia* and its counterpart that follows below when defining the terms in other places. For example, see Torrance, "Introduction: The Place of Christology in Biblical and Dogmatic Theology," 16, n. 1.

By *enhypostasia*, however, it asserted that in the *assumptio carnis* the human nature of Christ was given a real and concrete subsistence within the hypostatic union--it was enhypostatic in the Word.¹⁶¹

In this way, the Nestorian heresy is guarded against.

In his New College lectures, Torrance gives a fuller treatment of this anhypostatic-ehypostatic conception. He first introduces the couplet in his short overview christology lecture:

This is the doctrine of anhypostasis and enhypostasis regarded in their complementarity. (a) Anhypostasis asserts: because of the assumption of humanity by the Son, Christ's human nature has its subsistence in union with God, in God's subsistence or mode of being (hypostasis). It does not possess it in and for itself--hence an--hypostasis. (b) Enhypostasis asserts: because of the assumption of humanity of God, and co-exists in the divine subsistence or mode of being (hypostasis)--hence en--hypostasis. This means that Jesus had a fully human mind, will, and body; and was in complete possession of all human faculties. The bringing together of anhypostasis and enhypostasis in this way means that we are to think of Jesus Christ not so much in terms of God in man as in terms of God as man, but of God become man without ceasing to be God.¹⁶²

Note in passing that by definition these doctrines are twin conceptions, one unlikely to stand alone, as is clear even from the definition of anhypostasis given here by

¹⁶¹Torrance, "Atonement and the Oneness of the Church," 249. Again, for this definition, Torrance's debt to Barth or Barth's own source is obvious (compare with Barth, Church Dogmatics I/2, 162-165; and Heppe, 417-418, 428-429, 435). Further explaining his intent, Torrance says: "Enhypostasis means that in the incarnation there is full and complete human hypostasis, human person, in the person of the Son of God. So the incarnation of the Son of God, the person of the Son of God, does not involve the negating of a human person, but on the contrary, the establishing of a human person Or, I will put it another way, that the incarnating act of the person is a personalizing act. So that by becoming man, the Son of God personalized humanity. That is why we speak about the human nature and the divine nature in the one person" (Torrance, interview by the author, 29 January 1990, tape recording).

¹⁶²Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 3. Torrance's polemic against "God in man" is perhaps directed against D. M. Baillie's God Was in Christ (1948).

Torrance.¹⁶³ Conceptually, this is all the more true for enhypostasis, as the presence of the hypostasis in the divine person of the incarnate Christ requires there be no extra human hypostasis, unless Nestorianism is embraced, which Torrance certainly does not condone.¹⁶⁴

Torrance moves quickly in his New College lectures from a definition of the two terms to their application to our understanding of the hypostatic union in particular and christology in general:

Moreover, the doctrine of anhypostasis and enhypostasis is a very careful way of stating that we cannot think of the hypostatic union statically, but must think of it on the one hand in terms of the great divine act of grace in the Incarnation and on the other hand in terms of the dynamic personal union carried through the whole life of Jesus Christ from birth to resurrection.¹⁶⁵

Torrance clearly links this twofold understanding of the hypostatic union--as both a "great divine act of grace in the Incarnation" and a "dynamic personal union carried

¹⁶³Here Torrance defines anhypostasis using two sentences, the first of which is a definition of enhypostasis: "(a) Anhypostasis asserts: because of the assumption of humanity by the Son, Christ's human nature has its subsistence in union with God, in God's subsistence or mode of being (hypostasis). It does not possess it in and for itself--hence an--hypostasis." (Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 3). The second sentence of the definition is, more strictly speaking, anhypostasis. However, Torrance's composite definition does highlight the intimate nature of the two doctrines. The difficulty of clearly seeing what these terms expressed is argued by John Macquarrie, "Anhypostasia and Enhypostasia."

¹⁶⁴As an earlier development in christological thought, anhypostasis was not always understood to imply or require enhypostasis in the divine person of Christ. For example, Daley understands Leontius of Byzantium to teach that the hypostasis of the incarnate Christ resides not in either nature but only in their union per se (Daley, "'A Richer Union': Leontius of Byzantium and the Relationship of Human and Divine in Christ," 29-33). Torrance's treatment, however, assumes that the hypostasis is centered in the divine person (Torrance, "The Outline of the Person of Christ," 2).

¹⁶⁵Torrance, "The Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 3. Elsewhere, Torrance draws separate applications from each half of this couplet. See Torrance, "The Atonement and the Oneness of the Church," 252.

through the whole life of Jesus"--with each respective term in our couplet:

Anhypostasia, as the sheer act of divine grace, . . . refers therefore to a transcendent act of God, universal in its range, which is fulfilled by God himself and does not have to be forged or established by us. Enhypostasia, on the other hand, refers to the full reality and integrity of the human nature and life of Jesus in the Person of the Son or Logos of God, which he fulfilled as Man on our behalf. This implies that God relates himself to us not just in general . . . but within all that, by acutely personal relations, face to face, man to man in Jesus. In him, God comes into our being and life precisely as Man: he meets us in and through the single One, Jesus of Nazareth, and so singles us out one by one for direct, personal meeting.¹⁶⁶

Thus, each term of this ancient patristic couplet has a wider theological application in a different yet complementary direction. As a theological concept, anhypostasia is understood by Torrance as an act of God, or the incarnation narrowly conceived.¹⁶⁷ In turn, enhypostasia, as a theological concept, is understood by Torrance as a lifelong personal union, or the incarnation broadly and dynamically conceived, including the whole of Christ's life, through his resurrection from the dead.¹⁶⁸

This twofold understanding of the dynamic hypostatic union provides Torrance

¹⁶⁶Torrance, "The Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 3.

¹⁶⁷In his more detailed treatment of anhypostasia later in his New College lectures, Torrance repeats his analysis: "The first thing we have to note here, is that the anhypostasis asserts that the Incarnation is an act of pure grace alone . . ." (Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 8). Torrance also emphasizes the incarnation narrowly conceived in T. F. Torrance, "Justification: Its Radical Nature and Place in Reformed Doctrine and Life," Scottish Journal of Theology 13 (1960): 231.

¹⁶⁸In his more detailed treatment of enhypostasia later in his New College lectures, Torrance repeats his analysis: "Jesus had a fully human mind and human soul and human will, and lived a fully human life in hypostatic union with His divine life That is the emphasis of enhypostasia. It preserves the acknowledgement of the full humanity of Jesus, and indeed of His historical Person as a Man among other men, and as one of us men, a true Man" (Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 9).

with two categories in light of which he structures his presentation of positive christology in his New College lectures.¹⁶⁹ Anhypostasia and enhypostasia become general "rubrics" under which various doctrines are considered or upon which they respectively repose, which the opening paragraph of one of Torrance's early positive theology lectures makes clear:

If the doctrine of the Virgin Birth of Jesus comes appropriately under the rubric of anhypostasia, the doctrine of the Incarnate life of Jesus comes appropriately under the rubric of enhypostasia. Actually these cannot be separated in that way, but a relative stress does fall upon enhypostasia when we come to think of the Incarnational union of God and Man in Jesus Christ as a dynamic historical event carried through the whole earthly life and death of Jesus into the resurrection and ascension.¹⁷⁰

Torrance's positive christology lecture titles even reflect this method: anhypostasia is treated in "The Once for All Union of God and Man in Christ--the Birth of the Son into our Humanity," while enhypostasia is treated in "The Continuous Union in the

¹⁶⁹Torrance's New College lectures include both positive and historical presentations of christology, and their division in his lectures is clear. For example, the positive lectures include "The Once for All Union of God and Man in Christ--the Birth of the Son into our Humanity"; "The Continuous Union in the Historical Life and Obedience of Jesus"; and "The Life of Faithfulness of the Son Towards Man." The historical lectures include "The Patristic Doctrine of Christ" and "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ." This methodological division accounts for the necessity of his giving a full overview of historical theology in the lecture titled "The Outline of the Doctrine of Christ" before giving a detailed presentation of his positive christology. The basis of the positive lectures must be provided by a quick historical overview, as the fuller historical lectures come later in his outline. See T. F. Torrance, "Outline of Lectures," New College Lectures, personal collection of T. F. Torrance, 1.

¹⁷⁰Torrance, "The Continuous Union in the Historical Life and Obedience of Jesus," 1. Notwithstanding Torrance's hesitation to strictly divide doctrines under either rubric, he continues along this vein in this lecture and the positive lectures that come both before and after. His hesitation is doubtless due to the fact that the two halves of the twin patristic couplet belong together.

Historical Life and Obedience of Jesus."¹⁷¹ This set of titles for the two rubrics of anhypostasia and enhypostasia are not passing comments by Torrance, but a clear development in his christology:

To this once for all union corresponds the anhypostasia, and to the continuous personal union throughout the life of Christ corresponds the enhypostasia. Here the hypostatic union is understood not simply in terms of a state of union, but in terms of a divine movement of grace, which was translated into the history of the man Jesus Christ, the one Mediator between God and man. Hence all that the Son of God as man accomplished in his historical life and work belongs to the doctrine of the hypostatic union.¹⁷²

Thus, this twin patristic couplet, described by Trook as "the atomic structure of his thought," serves Torrance's development of wider Chalcedonian christology.

In his treatment of the virgin birth under the anhypostatic rubric, Torrance first treats the topic from a biblical or exegetical standpoint.¹⁷³ The more interesting section

¹⁷¹In the first of these lectures, Torrance considers the incarnation quite narrowly, giving a thorough biblical defense and theological analysis of the virgin birth (Torrance, "The Once for All Union of God and Man in Christ--the Birth of the Son into our Humanity"). In the second of these lectures, Torrance treats the implications of enhypostasia, after first re-emphasizing the unity of Christ's person as mediator (Torrance, "The Continuous Union in the Historical Life and Obedience of Jesus," 1). These two titles are repeated throughout Torrance's unpublished New College lectures. For example, when explaining the interconnection between the virgin birth and the resurrection, Torrance has recourse to these categories: "Just because the Incarnation is not only a once for all act of assumption of our flesh, but the continuous personal union of divine and human nature in the One Person of the Incarnate Son, . . . it is in the resurrection that we see the real meaning of the Virgin birth, while the Virgin birth has much to tell us about the resurrection" (Torrance, "The Once for All Union of God and Man in Christ--the Birth of the Son into our Humanity," 9). Thus, the applications of anhypostasia and enhypostasia in Torrance's unpublished New College lectures are even more numerous than his simple use of the terms.

¹⁷²Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 3.

¹⁷³Guthridge notes that Torrance's presentation here is dominated by his polemic against Bultmann. In his concern to show the importance of the virgin birth to both the Johannine and the Pauline writings, Torrance gives a fuller treatment of the virgin birth than found elsewhere in his corpus (Guthridge, 184). Torrance has now printed

for our purposes, however, is the doctrinal section. Here Torrance stresses that the virgin birth cannot be understood biologically but is a transcendent act of the Holy Spirit.¹⁷⁴ This mystery of the virgin birth is a sign of the mystery of Christ himself and, therefore, cannot be abstracted from the rest of his life and ultimately his resurrection.¹⁷⁵ Thus, Torrance concludes: "... they are one continuous act including the whole historical life and work of the Incarnate Son."¹⁷⁶

On a more positive note, Torrance draws conclusions from the virgin birth for the nature of Christ's incarnation:

The Virgin birth tells us that Jesus was really and genuinely the son of a human mother, that He was born as other men are, of a woman, and yet in a unique way which corresponds to His unique Person as the Son of the Eternal God who has entered into our humanity.¹⁷⁷

What specific factor makes it necessary for his birth to be unique? Torrance points first to the role of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit's involvement "means that the secret and

this lecture in a modified form as "The Doctrine of the Virgin Birth," Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology 12 (1994): 8-25. For a more popular form of this same lecture, see T. F. Torrance, "The Truth of the Virgin Birth," Glasgow Herald, 14 January 1994, 11.

¹⁷⁴Torrance, "The Once for All Union of God and Man in Christ--the Birth of the Son into our Humanity," 8.

¹⁷⁵Stressing this interconnection of Christ's virgin birth and "the continuous personal union of the divine and human nature in the One Person of the Incarnate Son," Torrance here retains a degree of correlation between his twin rubrics as he unfolds his positive christology under these respective headings. Torrance, "The Once for All Union of God and Man in Christ--the Birth of the Son into our Humanity," 9.

¹⁷⁶Torrance, "The Once for All Union of God and Man in Christ--the Birth of the Son into our Humanity," 9-10.

¹⁷⁷Torrance, "The Once for All Union of God and Man in Christ--the Birth of the Son into our Humanity," 11.

origin of Jesus lie wholly in God and in His Sovereign will and grace alone."¹⁷⁸ The Holy Spirit is not the ultimate factor, however, in determining the uniqueness of Christ's entrance into our world:

Thus the Incarnation of the Son into our humanity has its source in the hidden creative act of God, but it also assumes a form in the entry of the Son into our humanity which is appropriate to and is required by the nature of the incarnate Son as Creator as well as creature. The Birth of Jesus of the Virgin Mary through the creative operation of the Spirit corresponds to the whole secret of His Person and life and work, for it reveals in the most remarkable manner the way which the saving grace of God takes with our fallen humanity, as God the Creator and Redeemer actually with us in our human existence, and as God bringing out of our fallen and sinful existence a new humanity that is holy and perfect.¹⁷⁹

Since the incarnate Son is not just creature but also Creator, his incarnation into our humanity is conditioned by this important factor. Thus, Torrance specifies under anhypostasia that the nature of the incarnation itself accommodates the secret of his person and work.

Interestingly, Torrance develops his treatment of the second rubric, anhypostasia, under two headings of its own:

Because this whole life is hypostatic in the Son of God we have to see the life and work of Jesus on earth in relation to the Father, but because in the Son of God it is hypostatic, we have to see the life and work of Jesus on earth in relation to His fellow-men.¹⁸⁰

This double emphasis of anhypostasia--memorably taught by stressing first the

¹⁷⁸Torrance, "The Once for All Union of God and Man in Christ--the Birth of the Son into our Humanity," 11.

¹⁷⁹Torrance, "The Once for All Union of God and Man in Christ--the Birth of the Son into our Humanity," 11.

¹⁸⁰Torrance, "The Continuous Union in the Historical Life and Obedience of Jesus," 1.

prepositional prefix and then the root particle, respectively--is described under two major sections: "The Life of Faithfulness of the Son towards the Father" and "The Life of Faithfulness of the Son towards Man."¹⁸¹ Under the first section title, Torrance discusses Christ's prayers, the fallen context in which he lived, and his perfect life and glory.¹⁸² Under the second section title, Torrance discusses Christ's role as shepherd and king.¹⁸³

Therefore, in our overview of Torrance's development of the post-Chalcedonian couplet of anhypostasia and enhypostasia, we see a strong line of continuity with his earlier development of Chalcedonian christology in his Auburn Seminary lectures. In the Auburn lectures, his discussion of Christ's mediation was unfolded under two headings provided by John McLeod Campbell. The theological

¹⁸¹The first of these parts of Torrance's application of enhypostasia is included in the lecture "The Continuous Union in the Historical Life and Obedience of Jesus," while the second is so large that it occupies a separate lecture of its own, "The Life of Faithfulness of the Son towards Man" (Torrance, "Outline of Lectures," 1).

¹⁸²Torrance, "The Continuous Union in the Historical Life and Obedience of Jesus," 5-13. Throughout this section of Torrance's lecture, he is bringing together the active and passive obedience of Christ under this rubric: "Now we have to think of all this not only in terms of passive obedience but of active obedience, not only in terms of forensic and judicial righteousness and obedience, but in terms of positive communion and filial love, and of worship" (Torrance, "The Continuous Union in the Historical Life and Obedience of Jesus," 6). The discussion of Christ's prayer life and its relevance for Christian worship is expanded in T. F. Torrance, "The Mind of Christ in Worship: The Problem of Apollinarianism in the Liturgy," in Theology in Reconciliation: Essays Towards Evangelical and Catholic Unity in East and West (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1975), 139-214. Torrance's debt to John McLeod Campbell is obvious in these presentations. Compare with Campbell, 197-207, 214-216.

¹⁸³Torrance, "The Life of Faithfulness of the Son towards Man," 1-16. This treatment is more exegetical; the exegetical insights given appear to be drawn from Kittel's Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, although not mentioned by name.

content of these strands of christological analysis were provided by both Scottish and Continental sources, especially Campbell and Brunner. Here in his New College lectures, these two strands are now subsumed under the broader rubric of enhypostasia, but their double nature is still evident. Although he did not use the post-Chalcedonian terminology in his earlier treatment, it is also clear that the Auburn theme of Christ's universal representation based on his being the incarnate Creator--apparently drawn from Maurice via Dale, and Luther via Carlyle--now stands more on its own under the rubric of anhypostasia, rather than being subsumed under one of the earlier headings. This ancient patristic couplet is, thus, developed by Torrance well beyond what he received of it from Barth.

Thus, it becomes somewhat easier to see what Torrance means when he calls this patristic couplet a form of "theological algebra."¹⁸⁴ Like two lenses in a set of spectacles focused on the same object, or two variables in a linear equation, these two differing theological concepts give complementary information about the object in view, Jesus Christ.¹⁸⁵ They are two basic strands from which Torrance weaves his wider theological tapestry.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸⁴"As in natural science we must often cast our thought of certain connections into mathematical or algebraical form in order to see how these connections work out in the most consistent and rigorous way, so here we may well think of 'anhypostasia and enhypostasia' as a sort of 'theological algebra' to help us work out the 'inner logic' in Christology more consistently and purely" (Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 10).

¹⁸⁵"Anhypostasia and enhypostasia . . . are, rightly used, theological instruments or lenses through which we may discern more deeply and clearly into the ontological structures of the Incarnation" (Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 10).

¹⁸⁶For a similar type of analysis, though certainly more complex, of Barth's theology, see George Hunsinger, How to Read Karl Barth (New York: Oxford University Press,

Reformed Christology

After considering Post-Chalcedonian christology, Torrance next turns in his outline of christology to Reformed christology.¹⁸⁷ Following Barth, Torrance sees a close connection between the issues surrounding the ancient patristic couplet just considered and the later dispute between Lutheran and Reformed christology over the communicatio idiomatum.¹⁸⁸ However, Torrance quickly moves beyond Barth by considering the Reformed-Lutheran christological issues in more detail and developing further application of anhypostasia and enhypostasia in light of them.¹⁸⁹

1991), especially 4. Hunsinger identifies six major motifs in Barth's theology which repeatedly occur, and, if kept in mind by the reader, "can be used as felicitous categories of discernment when reading the *Church Dogmatics*" (Hunsinger, vii). The burden of proof upon Hunsinger, which he has ably handled, is to justify the motifs he identifies, since "the patterns are merely instruments of perception and not Barth's argument itself" (Hunsinger, viii). While similar, our task here is less demanding, as our two rubrics or strands, though imbedded in his unpublished lectures, are supplied by Torrance himself.

¹⁸⁷Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 3-4.

¹⁸⁸In the small print section where he discusses in detail the anhypostasis and enhypostasis of Christ's human nature, Barth immediately turns to this later dispute: "It was just at this point that the disagreement started in the 17th century between Lutheran and Reformed theology. What is the meaning of the eternal Word having given His own existence to a man's possibility of existence, to a man's being and nature, and so having given it reality?" (Barth, Church Dogmatics I/2, 163). Likewise, Torrance moves immediately from consideration of the patristic couplet to this later dispute (Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 3). In his fuller lecture on Reformed christology, Torrance again shows the interconnectedness of the concerns of these two different historical periods by discussing and applying more widely his development of anhypostasia and enhypostasia in light of his explanation of the Reformed and Lutheran views of the communicatio idiomatum. Torrance's fullest development of this patristic couplet may well occur, interestingly, in his lecture on Reformed, not patristic, christology (Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 5-10).

¹⁸⁹Barth also returns to the patristic couplet after discussing the Lutheran-Reformed debate, but merely to dismiss a misunderstanding of anhypostasis that construed it as meaning "without human personality" (Barth, Church Dogmatics I/2, 164-165). For

In his fuller lecture, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," Torrance begins by noting that the Reformers moved behind medieval scholasticism, returning to patristic roots in developing their christology. Instead of embracing a static, Aristotelian notion of substance and person, the Reformers favored more dynamic, biblical notions, which allow "the essential integration of Incarnation and Atonement."¹⁹⁰

In carrying out this reformulation of the doctrine of Christ, there were distinct differences between the Lutheran and the Reformed theologians, differences which in some measure reflected the old patristic distinctions between Alexandrian and Antiochene Christologies, the Lutherans inclining toward the Alexandrian Emphasis in NT exegesis, and in doctrine, and the Reformed inclining toward the Antiochene [sic] emphasis in NT exegesis and doctrine--and yet these distinctions are not so clear cut, for they actually criss-cross one another at significant points.¹⁹¹

Thus, in his treatment of the Lutheran and Reformed christologies, Torrance is again concerned to highlight "a more dynamic interpretation" of the hypostatic union, "drawing out the implications of the unio in terms of communio and communicatio."¹⁹²

In the balance of the lecture, Torrance singles out four main christological concepts of the period, which stress "the difference, but also the basic unity of the

an example of this misunderstanding of anhypostasia, see Brunner, The Mediator, 317-318.

¹⁹⁰Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 1.

¹⁹¹Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 1. Torrance goes on to note that the Lutherans were somewhat Euytchian, while the Reformed were somewhat Nestorian, reflecting "an inevitable duality in our human formulations of the doctrine of Christ, in which we must learn to see the important truths in both emphases and seek to combine them in the whole Truth of Christ. As the emphases appear between Lutherans and Reformed, they are not antitheses, but complementary and overlapping aspects of the Truth" (Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 2).

¹⁹²Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 2.

Reformation doctrine of the hypostatic union."¹⁹³ Thus, while Torrance contrasts the Lutheran and Reformed christologies, he develops the lines of continuity between them as well.¹⁹⁴

The first main concept Torrance treats is the "problem of the so-called 'extra-Calvinisticum.'"¹⁹⁵ He contrasts the Aristotelian notion of space as a container, which was adopted by the Lutherans, with the more relational concept of space developed by the Greek Fathers and adopted by Calvin.¹⁹⁶ Torrance's treatment of this point of dispute between the Lutheran and Reformed is not partisan, but ecumenical:

. . . the Lutherans had their important point: that with the Incarnation of the

¹⁹³Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 2.

¹⁹⁴This ecumenical concern is also motivating Barth in his treatment of the Lutheran-Reformed debate: ". . . in the case of the Reformed . . . and in that of the Lutherans . . . , it ought not to have been impossible to reach an understanding on what was in the last resort their common intention" (Barth, Church Dogmatics I/2, 164). In his treatment of these four concepts that follows, Torrance appears to be drawing from Heppe's Reformed Dogmatics, as his outline follows Heppe's compilation at key points and Torrance quotes selectively from Heppe, as will be shown.

¹⁹⁵Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 2-4. On the extra-Calvinisticum, see John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion (1559 edition), ed. J. T. McNeill, trans. F. L. Battles, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960), II.13.4 (1:481) [CO 2:352]; Heppe, 447; and David Willis, Calvin's Catholic Christology (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966).

¹⁹⁶Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 2-4, especially 3. Torrance traces the influence of Aristotle's Physics (IV.C.5, 212 A 20) and its receptical notion of space through Ockam and Aquinas to the Lutheran theologians. Calvin and the Reformed, however, were influenced by unspecified "Greek Fathers" in their more relational view of space. Richard Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity (Book V, chapters LII-LVI) is specified as also breaking with the Aristotelian approach. Did Torrance develop this idea from Barth? See Barth's comments on the Lutheran "spatial limiting" in Barth, Church Dogmatics I/2, 167. For more development of this idea, see Torrance, Space, Time and Incarnation, 25-38, 56-60. For a critique of this line of analysis, see Wolfhart Pannenberg, Systematic Theology, vol. 2, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 86, n. 224; 88, n. 228; 89, n. 229.

Word, we must never think of the Word apart from the Man Jesus, with whom the Word is for ever united, and is not to be apart from Him. Now that the Incarnation has taken place, we must say that the Son is none other than Jesus, but is identical with Him. . . . Here we are not to think then of alternatives or a contradiction, but rather of two complementary aspects of the Truth which belong to the mystery of Christ, and which we are unable to put into precise language in such a way as to express the whole truth in a unitary way. (c. KB, CD, 1/2, pp. 168ff; 4/1, pp. 180ff.).¹⁹⁷

The second main concept Torrance treats is the communio naturarum.¹⁹⁸ The Reformed asserted

a unio immediata between the human nature and the Person of the Son, but a union mediata between the divine and human natures through the Spirit. In that way, the Reformed theologians sought to speak of an active communion between the natures without teaching a doctrine of mutual interpenetration between the natures, which is precisely what the Lutheran conception of mutual communion or participation led to.¹⁹⁹

Again, Torrance appreciates one aspect of Lutheran thought on the matter:

We must emphasise with the Lutherans that there is a real difference, participation of the divine in the human is not the same as participation of the human in the divine. It is the divine act that gives, and gives to the human nature; it is the human act only to receive, and receive from the divine nature. But for that reason, there is no reciprocity here of the kind that the relationship can be reversed.²⁰⁰

The third main concept Torrance treats is the communicatio idiomatum.²⁰¹

After presenting the Lutheran version of the doctrine and identifying its telos in "that deification of man which we find in 19th century German philosophy," Torrance

¹⁹⁷Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 4.

¹⁹⁸Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 4-5. Here Torrance is drawing from Schmid's Die Dogmatik, 230f.

¹⁹⁹Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 5.

²⁰⁰Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 5.

²⁰¹Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 5-8. Torrance appears to be drawing from Hefpe, 439-447.

describes in detail the Reformed doctrine.²⁰² The Reformed "spoke of a triple communio or communicatio in the hypostatic union"--the communicatio gratiarum, the communicatio idiomatum, and the communicatio operationum.

The first of these communications focused upon the growth in the gifts of grace throughout Christ's life:

By this is not meant that as Jesus grew into manhood there was especially after His baptism, an increase in union between His divine and human natures, as though that were not already completed once and for all in His birth, but what is meant is that from the first moment of His life, His properties as God and man, and the communication of the properties of His divine and human natures, effectively entered into operation step by step with His developing human life--and here we think especially of the graces of knowledge, will and power in which He increased and grew, growing in knowledge, and learning obedience.²⁰³

The second of these communications focused upon the person in which the two natures are united:

Thus communicatio idiomatum can only mean that what is proper to one nature in Christ, is attributed not to the other nature as such but to the person named from the other nature, whether divine or human. Thus the properties of each of the two natures coincide in one and the same Person, and are thereby also predicated of that Person.²⁰⁴

Quoting from Amandus Polanus, Torrance stresses the importance of this level of communication for the fulfillment of Christ's mediatorial office and the third level of

²⁰²Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 6.

²⁰³Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 6. Here Torrance appears to be drawing from Heppe, 434-439.

²⁰⁴Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 7. Here Torrance appears to be drawing from Heppe, 439-445.

communication, the communicatio operationum.²⁰⁵ This third communication is "a communication of the divine and human acts in the One Person of Christ."²⁰⁶

In Him there takes place such a union and communion between His divine and human natures, that the divine acts are acts in His human nature, and the human acts are in His divine Person. Each nature in communion with the other performs acts appropriate to it, but performs them as acts of the one person who embraces both natures, and is the One Subject of all the divine and human acts.²⁰⁷

In all this, Torrance is following rather strictly the line of Heppe.

However, Torrance's treatment of the communicatio operationum does not end there. Instead, he extends his development of the doctrine beyond Heppe's treatment, finding in this third communication a deeper level on which to integrate the person and work of Christ:

But communicatio operationum is concerned with more than that. It asserts a dynamic communion between the divine and human natures of Christ, in terms of His atoning and reconciling work. It stresses the union of two natures for mediatorial operations in such a way that these works proceed from the one Person of the God-Man by the distinct effectiveness of both natures.²⁰⁸

But what conclusions does Torrance draw? In the next two sentences he explains:

In other words, the whole dynamic movement of the hypostatic union has to be understood in terms of the fact that God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, and so the hypostatic union is the ontological side of the dynamic action of reconciliation. Thus we understand the meaning of the hypostatic union not merely in terms of the Incarnation, but in terms of the reconciliation

²⁰⁵Without mentioning the name or source, Torrance quotes two sentences from Thomson's translation of Polanus' Syntagma Theologiae Christianae (1624), given in Heppe, 439-440 (compare Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 7).

²⁰⁶Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 7. Here Torrance appears to be drawing from Heppe, 445-446.

²⁰⁷Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 7.

²⁰⁸Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 7.

between God and Man, and we understand the Reconciliation not simply in terms of Christ's work on the Cross, but in terms of His Incarnation, so that the reconciling union of God and man is understood as wrought out in the historical person of Christ, and in the whole course of His historical life and death and resurrection from the dead.²⁰⁹

In the Reformed christology section of his outline overview of christology, after an initial opening sentence, Torrance moves directly to this same conclusion:

Thus the doctrine of hypostatic union has to be stated in soteriological as well as ontological terms, in order to give its full truth in accordance with the whole life and work of Christ. This is a distinctive contribution of Reformed theology in the doctrine of Christ, as expressed in the concept of the communicatio operationum, in which the relation of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ is construed not simply in terms of distinctive properties or idiomata but in terms of distinctive operations: the act of God toward man, and the act of man toward God, in Jesus Christ.²¹⁰

Thus, here in the communicatio operationum, Torrance sees the person and work, the incarnation and atonement, as being brought into dynamic relation.

Torrance is able to develop his understanding of the communicatio operationum beyond the Reformed Scholastics because he is not inhibited by "the Greek conception of the immutability of God," which prevented them from drawing this further conclusion:

God was the prisoner of His own immutability, and His own impassibility. Thus, even in a doctrine of the communicatio operationum, the reformed theologians like Polanus insisted on speaking of participation by the divine nature of the Son in the work of atonement on the Cross, as kat'oikonomian, by way of economy, which was meant to guard the changelessness of the divine

²⁰⁹Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 7.

²¹⁰Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 3. Note the two strands of the enhypostasia rubric, seen first in the Auburn lectures and previously in the New College lectures, again appear, little modified from their original form developed from Campbell.

being and nature.²¹¹

Taking issue with this emphasis upon divine economy, Torrance sees a closer union between the divine person and the human nature assumed:

But in this act of unspeakable humiliation God was not simply using the humanity of Christ as His organ or instrument, while He remained transcendent to it all: He Himself actually came, the immutable God, humbling Himself to become a creature, and to suffer as a creature our judgement and death²¹²

Thus, Torrance can interrelate the divine Creator and the created humanity:

As the Creator condescended to be a creature, He did not make the creature Creator, but in its unity of existence with His Son, He assumed it into fellowship with His being as God, Creator and Lord. But let us be clear about this fact, that it was the act of divine self-humiliation as such which did that, which is the exaltation of the Man Jesus, and in Him, of our human nature into union and communion with the life and being of God.²¹³

Therefore, the created humanity of Christ is not merely instrumental to his person but is more than that. How much more is clarified in the final section of Torrance's lecture.

The fourth main concept Torrance treats under Reformed christology is the doctrine of anhypostasis and enhypostasis.²¹⁴ Why treat this patristic couplet again under Reformed christology after having done so under Post-Chalcedonian? In his outline overview of the doctrine of Christ, Torrance mixes his interest in the Reformed

²¹¹Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 7. Torrance is here drawing from Heppe, 439.

²¹²Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 7. Torrance's later polemic against Christ's humanity as an instrument or organ is against this Protestant scholastic background.

²¹³Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 8.

²¹⁴Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 8-10.

development of the communicatio operationum with the previously examined patristic couplet.²¹⁵ Here in his more extended lecture on Reformed christology, he makes the connection quite plain:

The Reformed theologians insisted that the assumption of the humanity into the person of the Son of God is not an assumption of it into the divine nature but into the person of the Logos. They made use of the concepts of anhypostasis and enhypostasis to express that accurately, bringing them fully and clearly together, and thus marking real advance over the patristic usage of these concepts.²¹⁶

Torrance next cites from Johannes Henricus Heidegger's Corpus Theologiae (1700), quoted in Heppe, to clarify his point:

Two statements from Heidegger may be adduced here (Heppe, Ref. Dog., pp. 427ff.): "... the assumption of human nature into the person of the Son of God, whereby the Logos, the Son of God, in the very moment of formation and sanctification assumed the human nature void of an hypostasis of its own into the unity of its own person, in order that there might be one and the same hypostasis of the Logos assuming and of the human nature assumed, outside of which it neither ever subsists, nor can subsist."²¹⁷

In the context in which Heidegger is quoted, Heppe is expounding the three acts of the

²¹⁵Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 3: "This is a distinctive contribution of Reformed theology in the doctrine of Christ, as expressed in the concept of the communicatio operationum . . . : the act of God toward man, and the act of man toward God, in Jesus Christ. The incarnation involves a union of God and man in Jesus Christ once and for all accomplished, but also involves a living union continuous through the life of the historical Jesus Christ moving from his birth to his resurrection. To this once and for all union corresponds the anhypostasia, and to the continuous personal union throughout the life of Christ corresponds the enhypostasia."

²¹⁶Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 8. Notice that this comment relativizes the importance of the original patristic sources of this theological couplet, such as Cyril of Alexandria and Leontius of Byzantium, for Torrance's development of it. He is profoundly influenced by the Protestant scholastic development of the couplet, so the distinctiveness of its patristic roots becomes less of a concern in our study.

²¹⁷Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 8, quoting Heppe, 427. Torrance slightly modifies the quotation to fit his needs, without altering content.

Holy Spirit in Christ's conception: the formation of the human nature, the sanctification of the human nature, and the assumption of the human nature into the person of the Son of God.²¹⁸ Torrance's first quote from Heidegger, as given above, leaves off Heppe's introductory statement: "The third act of the H. Spirit in the conception of Christ is the 'assumption'"²¹⁹ Thus, here Torrance's stress on the assumption of the human nature into the Logos when developing his doctrine of anhypostasia and enhypostasia eclipses the role of the Holy Spirit in the assumption, which was Heppe and Heidegger's original concern.

But what of the second quote from Heidegger by Torrance? Torrance continues in his next sentence:

But because the human nature assumed in the Incarnation is more than human nature in general, because in the Incarnation Jesus the individual Man is the human nature in with the eternal Son, more must be said. "The human nature is per se anhypostatos and becomes enhypostatos in the Logos, who being pre-existent, in fact existent from all eternity, has received in time the form of a servant, and assumed the see of Abraham as its shrine and instrument."²²⁰

This second quotation from Heidegger becomes Torrance's jumping-off point for the rest of his lecture.

Notice that once again Torrance views the incarnation as a double relation: Christ's human nature is at once human nature in general and human nature in a

²¹⁸Heppe, 424-428.

²¹⁹Heppe, 427. In fact, Torrance shows no awareness of the context from which he has lifted Heidegger's comments. Concern to clarify the role of the Holy Spirit in the assumptio carnis is not displayed here by Torrance.

²²⁰Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 8; quoting Heppe, 428. Again, Torrance slightly modifies the quotation to fit his needs, without altering content.

particular individual man.²²¹ Following his previous method and development, Torrance attaches the different halves of the ancient patristic couplet, now in its fuller Protestant scholastic development, to each side of this double relation:

The anhypostasia stresses the general humanity of Jesus, the human nature assumed by the Son with its hypostasis in the Son, but enhypostasia stresses the particular humanity of the One Man Jesus, whose person is not other than the Person of the divine Son.²²²

Next, Torrance relates this two-sided treatment of Christ's human nature back to the virgin birth, completing the circle of his christological reasoning around this theme:

Therefore from the enhypostasia we have to go back again to the anhypostasia and say this: while the Son of God assumed our human nature, and became fully and really like us, nevertheless, His full and complete human nature was united to God in a unique way, (hypostatically in one person) as our human nature is not, and will never be. Therefore He is unlike us, not unlike us as to the humanity of His human nature, but in the unique union of His human nature to the Divine nature in the One Person of God the Son. (This is the baffling element in the Virgin Birth, which tells us that while it is our very human nature He assumed, He did not assume it in the way we share in it, because He took it in a unique relation with His Deity). But it is upon the unique, hypostatic relation of His human nature to His divine nature, that the truth of our human nature depends, for we are in union and communion with God, as we share in His human nature, which is hypostatically united to God.²²³

Thus, Torrance again relates anhypostasia to the virgin birth, but this time highlighting what that rubric or strand of christology implies not just for the uniqueness of Christ's entrance into our world but for his unique hold on our humanity:

The anhypostasia and enhypostasia taken together tell us that the Incarnation was the union of the Word of God with mankind in its solidarity with all men; yet it was union with One Man, or rather such a union with all men that it was

²²¹For previous examples of this double relation of the incarnation, see Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 218, 279-280.

²²²Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 9.

²²³Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 9.

achieved and wrought out in and through this One Man, Jesus of Bethlehem and Nazareth for all men.²²⁴

Of this solidarity, more will be said later.

Clearly, Torrance's development of anhypostasia, or his anhypostatic strand, in light of Reformed christology builds on the earlier theme of Christ's creational solidarity with humankind in his Auburn lectures. There we saw the influence on Torrance's developing thought of F. D. Maurice's representative Christ who is the head of the race, as well as Thomas Carlyle's Christ "the proper Man," his provocative translation of the famous hymn by Martin Luther. This developing theme, which was then attached to Campbell's "Act of Christ on Behalf of Man" heading in Torrance's presentation of the mediation of Christ, now stands fully on its own under the anhypostatic rubric, while Campbell's headings have been subsumed as twin themes under the enhypostatic rubric. Now more fully grounded in the doctrine of creation, this anhypostatic creational solidarity with humankind highlights not only Christ's unique entrance into our world via the virgin birth, but it also underscores Christ's unique hold on our humanity in his person.

Torrance's method of interrelating patristic and Reformed themes continues in his initial outline of christology as he closes his treatment of Reformed christology. Here two themes for which Torrance is quite well known appear in the outline lecture for the first time.²²⁵ This placement of these themes in Torrance's most succinct lecture is instructive, as it warns us against beginning our journey to greater appreciation of

²²⁴Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 9.

²²⁵Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 4.

his christology at these points. Powerful in rhetorical horizon, these two themes are apt to overpower the other unique features of Torrance's development of christology if given primary posting. The first of these themes is the fallen humanity of Christ, and the second, closely related theme is "the unassumed is the unhealed."²²⁶

Doubtless, Torrance was familiar with the controversial teaching of the fallen humanity of Christ from his New College professor, H. R. Mackintosh. In his The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ to which Torrance so often turned in his Auburn lectures, Mackintosh chides nineteenth-century Scottish pastor and theologian Edward Irving for embracing the idea that Christ's human nature was fallen.²²⁷ Mackintosh's theological dismissal of Irving's teaching is succinct:

Of this eccentric though touching view it may be said, briefly, that the oneness of our Lord with us in the moral conflict, which was for Irving the heart of all things, is indeed a great fact; yet a theory of it is not to be purchased at the price of asserting that His Humanity was corrupt, with a corruptness which only the Holy Spirit could hold in check. . . . There can be no doubt that Irving passionately repudiated the idea of Christ having *actually* sinned; but it is after all only a loose idea of sinlessness which takes it as compatible with the existence in Christ of a potential fault and strong efficacious germ of evil, divergent even as undeveloped from the Divine standard of perfect righteousness; which is the connotation of 'fallen human nature' and 'original sin' in all other cases.²²⁸

²²⁶For convenience, in future citations, this originally Greek patristic theme, so memorably put by Gregory of Nazianzen--Τὸ γὰρ ἀπρόσληπτον ἀθεράπευτον--will be designated by its Latin title, the non-assumptus. For an example of such usage, see Jay W. Richards, "Can a Male Saviour Save Women?: Gregory of Nazianzen on the Logos' Assumption of Human Nature," presented at the Evangelical Theological Society Annual Conference, November 1996, in Jackson, Mississippi (USA). This paper by a Princeton doctoral student effectively employs the Latin shorthand for the Greek phrase.

²²⁷Mackintosh, 276-278.

²²⁸Mackintosh, 277-278.

With Marcus Dods, George Smeaton, A. B. Bruce, and the Scottish theology of his day, H. R. Mackintosh clearly rejects Irving's christology.²²⁹

The attitude, however, of Torrance's Basel mentor towards Irving is different.

In his Church Dogmatics I/2, which so influenced the young Torrance in Auburn,

Barth boldly asserts the fallen humanity doctrine:

So far we have looked upon σάρξ as a description of neutral human nature. This fact, too, that the Word became flesh, we have had to establish in its generality. But what the New Testament calls σάρξ includes not only the concept of man in general but also, assuming and including this general concept, the narrower concept of the man who is liable to the judgment and verdict of God, who having become incapable of knowing and loving God must incur the wrath of God, whose existence has become one exposed to death because he has sinned against God. Flesh in the concrete form of human nature marked by Adam's fall²³⁰

In the small print section that follows, Barth lists figures throughout church history

²²⁹For earlier critiques of Irving's christology, see Marcus Dods, On the Incarnation of the Eternal Word (London: R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1831); George Smeaton, Christ's Doctrine of the Atonement (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1871), 122-128; and A. B. Bruce, The Humiliation of Christ in its Physical, Ethical, and Official Aspects: The Sixth Series of the Cunningham Lectures (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 5th edition, 1900), 250-257. Referring to Irving's life as "one of the greatest and saddest of the century," Mackintosh remarks: "No modern thinker with whom I am acquainted could be said to hold Irving's position" (Mackintosh, 276, 277, n. 1). For more recent studies of the subject, see Harry Johnson, The Humanity of the Saviour: A Biblical and Historical Study of the Human Nature of Christ in Relation to Original Sin, with special reference to its Soteriological Significance (London: The Epworth Press, 1962); Nicholas R. Needham, "Appendix V: The Historical Pedigree of Edward Irving's Christology," Thomas Erskine of Linlathen: His Life and Theology, 1788-1837 (Edinburgh: Rutherford House Books, 1990), 474-477; and Donald Macleod, "Christology," 172, 175.

²³⁰Barth, Church Dogmatics I/2, 151. Barth goes on later in the small print section following these opening remarks to his fourth sub-section to identify the nature that Christ assumed as "*natura vitiosa*." He also admits: "All earlier theology, up to and including the Reformers and their successors, exercised at this point a very understandable reserve, calculated to dilute the offense . . ." (Barth, Church Dogmatics I/2, 153). Barth, however, boldly sides against the traditional understanding.

who have embraced this controversial christology, and Edward Irving is the second:

All earlier theology, up to and including the Reformers and their successors, exercised at this point a very understandable reserve, calculated to dilute the offence, but also to weaken the high positive meaning of passages like 2 Cor. 5²¹, Gal. 3¹³. In virtue of its distinctive moralism, modern theology as a whole is obviously unable to change this. But we have to admit that at the very heart of it certain sorties have actually been made in this direction. Above all, mention must here be made of Gottfried Menken The same doctrine was delivered about 1827 by the Scottish theologian Edward Irving and it led to his excommunication: "This point of issue is simply this, whether Christ's flesh had the grace of sinlessness and incorruption from its own nature or from the indwelling of the Holy Ghost; I say the latter It was manhood fallen which He took up into His Divine person, in order to prove the grace and the might of the Godhead in redeeming it." So the humanity was without guilt but with everything else that belongs to man, and was "held like a fortress in immaculate purity by the Godhead within." "Christ was holy in spite of the law of the flesh working in Him as in another man; but never in Him prevailing" (cited by H. R. Mackintosh, *The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ*, 1931 p. 277: cf. PRE.³ vol. 9 p. 427).²³¹

Barth appears to know of Irving only at second hand from Mackintosh, turning

Mackintosh's critical remarks into a high commendation.²³²

In his Auburn christology lectures, Torrance is clearly caught in mid-channel between his late Scottish professor and his new Continental mentor. Working through Church Dogmatics I/2, Torrance runs headlong into Barth's bold assertion of the fallen humanity doctrine. How does the young Scot respond? At first, Torrance follows Barth's treatment of σαρκί:

The word 'flesh' in the NT generally denotes fallen humanity under the sentence and wrath of God. Flesh is thus the concrete form of humanity under the fall, the form of the man who needs to be redeemed and reconciled to God.

²³¹Barth, Church Dogmatics I/2, 153-154. The ellipses are Barth's.

²³²The other theologians in favor of the fallen humanity of Christ to whom Barth refers are: J. C. K. v. Hofmann of Erlangen, H. F. Kohlbrügge, Edward Bohl, and H. Bezzel. Including Menken and Irving, Barth lists these six in chronological order. Barth, Church Dogmatics I/2, 154-155.

It is to this humanity that God in His great mercy descends; and it is bone of this bone and flesh of this flesh that He assumes. That must mean that the flesh He assumes is not to be thought of in some neutral sense, but as really our flesh. He has come to redeem US, to destroy sin in human flesh; and therefore He becomes what we are that He might lift us up to where He is. He who knew no sin became sin for us that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.²³³

But just at this point, again we see the profound influence of traditional Scottish theology influencing the young Torrance's developing thought. After having followed Barth's lead quite closely on the previous topics in "§ 15 The Mystery of Revelation," Torrance hesitates to go further:

We must be careful here. Jesus was no sinful man, but He entered a fallen race and identified Himself solidarily with human sin; made under the law He came under the curse of the law. There are two extreme views here corresponding again almost to ebionite and docetic views. On the one hand the humanity of Christ is represented as corrupt as any man's, and only maintained in a sinless life with the utmost struggle against sin in the flesh. This is the view of Edward Irving, for example, who holds that the sinlessness of Christ was not due to his own nature but to the indwelling of the Spirit.²³⁴

While Torrance is clearly attracted by the theme of solidarity with fallen man in Irving's christology, he cannot with Barth endorse this approach:

²³³Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 202. Torrance's polemic against "neutral" flesh, which is drawn from Barth, is repeated in later treatments of this theme.

²³⁴Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 202-203. Torrance's caution is reminiscent of A. B. Bruce's reflection on the Irvingite controversy: "Another thing very forcibly strikes the mind of one who has perused the literature of this theory, viz., the rhetorical inexactitude, and absence of carefully discriminated thought, characteristic of its advocates" (A. B. Bruce, The Humiliation of Christ, 255). The docetic extreme Torrance has in mind here is deification of Christ's flesh, on which Torrance comments elsewhere. For example, in 1948 Torrance comments: "Similarly their doctrine of the assumption of the manhood of Jesus into God ultimately means its divinisation. Seeds of this heresy are even to be found in the great Athanasius--and it had to be corrected at *Chalcedon*." Torrance, "Concerning the Ministry," Scottish Journal of Theology 1 (1948): 197-198.

We cannot think of Christ's becoming flesh in a sense which would separate His flesh from ours, and yet we cannot think of His flesh as corrupt in the sense of Irving. Nevertheless we must think of Christ as having entered into our fallen humanity in order to judge sin in the flesh and redeem it.²³⁵

Instead, Torrance points not to the Holy Spirit but to the union of human nature with the divine person as the key christological factor that resolves the dilemma:

We must remember that there are not two separate natures in Christ, there are two natures hypostatically united in one Person; that the Word of God has really become one with Jesus the Man; that God has really assumed flesh to be one with the Word of God. Now we cannot think of this one single united nature as in any sense corrupt, but in the most supreme sense Holy.²³⁶

The obviously Eutychian overtones of the statement above should not be allowed to throw us off the trail of Torrance's developing thought.²³⁷ Taken in context, Torrance is not intending to propose a return to Eutychianism as a solution for avoiding the extremes of Doceticism and Ebionism. Instead, the young Scot is perhaps over-enthusiastically stressing his main point: the union of the divine person and human nature in Christ.

Torrance acknowledges that Mary was fallen and Christ's flesh traced its origins to her:

²³⁵Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 203. Interestingly, in his very recent book Scottish Theology, Torrance does not even mention Edward Irving. Instead, to develop his treatment of the fallen humanity of Christ Torrance chooses to treat Thomas Erskine of Linlathen (1788-1870), who also held the doctrine, but in a more restrained manner than Irving. That Torrance would treat Erskine without even mentioning his friend Irving is a silence that is deafening (Torrance, Scottish Theology, 263-277). Erskine also taught "his doctrine of the organic Headship of Christ over all humanity" (Torrance, Scottish Theology, 275).

²³⁶Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 203.

²³⁷To say that Christ had "one single united nature" could be understood as rather Eutychian. But that is hardly Torrance's intent.

She was part of fallen humanity, and our Lord partook of Her flesh. Thus we must say that Christ entered into fallen and corrupt humanity; we cannot say that His flesh was created out of nothing and absolutely *de novo*, it was created out of fallen humanity, but without the will of fallen humanity. In this Union the flesh of Christ becomes Holy though it is a member of humanity under the curse of the law, under the ban of God's wrath.²³⁸

But on what basis does Torrance deny "the will of fallen humanity" to Christ? The answer to this important question is found in Torrance's early construction of Christ's personality. A few pages later, when treating in no small detail the issue of Christ's temptability, Torrance reflects:

And just here is our problem. We know that Jesus, thus perfect, underwent repeated and dire temptation acute and trenchant in its attack, more powerful than any temptation has ever assailed us. For against Him the perfect Son of God all the powers of evil marshalled themselves in full force. We must see here a real temptation, and yet we must say that the victory was bound to be won. Faith will not allow it that Jesus Christ might have fallen victim to temptation, that the divine plan might have been frustrated, that God might have been defeated. Thus the victory of Christ over temptation must be ascribed to the presence of God in Christ, to the fact that Jesus the Man had become One with the Divine Word. Christ's personality was divine; ours is human and grows up in the struggle with evil, and indeed it is evil that often makes our personalities.²³⁹

For the two full pages that follow, a long quote from Brunner is given, confirming that the human personality is the seat of sin in us and that Christ had a divine and not a human personality.²⁴⁰ It is, therefore, in light of this fact, easier to understand

²³⁸Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 203.

²³⁹Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 206.

²⁴⁰Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 206-208; quoting Brunner, The Mediator, 318-320. At this early stage in his life, instead of following Barth, who includes a clear place for a human personality in Christ, Torrance appears to be more indebted to Brunner. Another contributor to Torrance's understanding of Christ's divine personality is P. T. Forsyth. Across the bottom of the last page of this long Brunner quote is written: "Vide P. T. Forsyth: *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*, p. 285*--N.B." (Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 208). Forsyth writes: "If His

Torrance's summary conclusion about Irving:

Thus we are to think of Christ's flesh as sinless in His own nature, and not simply in virtue of the Spirit, as Irving puts it. We must think of Him nevertheless as really one with us, as really a member of our fallen race who is tempted in all points like as we are, though without sin. Were he not really of us, he would not be OUR reconciler or redeemer or Mediator. Were he not really of us, his humanity would be really docetic.²⁴¹

Having addressed Irving's christology--affirming in the face of it both Christ's solidarity with fallen man and the perfection of his humanity--Torrance next pushes his development of the human nature of Christ two last steps. Addressing the question of original sin and Christ's humanity, Torrance concludes:

We cannot think of Jesus as having original sin, for His Personality was Divine, and the secret of His Person was not on the human but the divine side of reality. Nevertheless He entered the sphere of corrupted humanity and we must think of Him as under the same condemnation as we are, not because He sinned, but because He loved us even unto death.²⁴²

And here Torrance fills out his understanding of Christ's humanity in relation to fallen humanity:

We must think of His humanity as thus coming under the conditions of fallen and corruptible humanity - for he was able to suffer, was weak with weariness, hungered and thirsted; His humanity was not immortal; but He suffered death and through this suffering was made perfect - that is, He condemned sin in the Flesh and presented Himself before the Father bearing the sin and guilt of a fallen humanity; he met the curse of the law and drank to the dregs the cup of Gethsemane, the results of sin. He entered into Hell, suffered the 'Eli, Eli, Lamma sabachthani' and yielded up the Ghost under the burden of sin and

Father be *the* Father, his Sonship is *the* Sonship. He held a relation to God as Father that never existed in any man before. Nay more, it was one that no man can ever reach again. Geniuses are repeated, but Christ never, the Son never. *For this relation constituted his personality* (Forsyth, The Person and Place of Jesus Christ, 285).

²⁴¹Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 203.

²⁴²Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 204.

Thus, in solidarity with fallen men because of the origin of his humanity, while at the same time not sharing in their original sin due to his divine personality, Christ lived under the conditions of fallen humanity, though not deserving it in himself.

Why, then, does Christ's solidarity in the flesh not result in his having a fallen human nature? Christ's divine personality is clearly part of Torrance's answer, as we have seen. But here Torrance reveals his final and most profound christological insight on this topic, which was hinted at earlier and consumed his attention for years to come:

Thus we are to say that He was made in the 'likeness of sinful flesh' yet without sin, and His Person sanctified the very flesh He assumed from the Virgin, and though tempted in all points as we are He was perfect.²⁴⁴

Rather than pointing with Irving to the Holy Spirit as the secret of Christ's human purity, Torrance points to Christ's divine person as the responsible agent. Not the Spirit but Christ's divine person sanctified the fallen flesh he assumed from Mary.²⁴⁵

Interestingly, in the margin next to this important conclusion is written an

²⁴³Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 204.

²⁴⁴Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 204.

²⁴⁵The older Protestant scholastic contention was that Mary's seed was sanctified by the Holy Spirit at the time of the virginal conception (Heppe, 427). Irving, however, rejected this traditional understanding: "Irving completely repudiated the idea that the human nature of Christ was sanctified at birth by the power of the Holy Spirit" (Macleod, "Christology," 175). Instead, Irving affirmed the Holy Spirit kept Christ from sinning throughout his life (Mackintosh, 277-278). Torrance here, however, turns away from the Holy Spirit to the divine person of Christ as the agent of the flesh's sanctification. In the absence of further qualification and in the presence of a denial of a human personality and will to Jesus, Torrance leaves the reader with the clear impression that the sanctification of the assumed flesh occurs at the virginal conception: "... His Person sanctified the very flesh He assumed from the Virgin ... " (Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 204).

ironic note: "'The assumed is the unhealed' H. R. M. p. 404."²⁴⁶ This is the first reference to the non-assumptus in Torrance's corpus, and its context justifies our previous contention that these two themes--the fallen humanity of Christ and the non-assumptus--belong together in Torrance's christology.²⁴⁷

With homiletical power, Torrance exults in this christological insight, the apex of his treatment of Christ's fallen humanity in the Auburn lectures:

We cannot hope to enter into this profound fact much further; only the Christ knows what He endured and what He suffered for us, in becoming one with us and uniting Himself to a fallen and accursed race under the ban and wrath of God. But He did actually do that, and yet remained Holy, sinless and yet made sin for us. Thank God He did remain Holy, sinless and yet made sin for us. Thank God He did remain sinless and burst through the bounds of sinful flesh, and all the conditions and weaknesses that accrued from the Fall. Thank God He has thereby created a new humanity even out of our sinful flesh and has placed it eternally in the heaven. And in our faith we are hid with Christ in God, assimilated to Him, recreated anew in Him, the Man who is Mediator between God and man, the Captain of our Salvation. Let no man think crudely or contemptibly of the humanity of Christ made sin for us, but let no man think it to be any more than Human, for it was not. He was God-man, perfect One with God & H.S.²⁴⁸

Again, a marginal note gives a clue as to another source from which Torrance is

²⁴⁶Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 204. Torrance's longhand note is quite clear here, and there is no doubt that he has made a slip of the pen--perhaps in excitement--in writing "assumed" instead of "unassumed." The cryptic reference is to H. R. Mackintosh's The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ: "If the manhood of Christ is unreal, at any remotest point, God has not quite stooped to unity with man. He has not come so low as we require; there has been reservation and refusal; some part of our burden, after all, has been left untouched. 'The unassumed is the unhealed.' In that case, no matter from what height Christ came, He has not reached to *us*, but has stopped short. 'The little less, and what worlds away!' But it has not been so" (Mackintosh, 404).

²⁴⁷The non-assumptus does not appear in Torrance's unpublished corpus again until his New College lectures (pre-1965) or in his published corpus until Theology in Reconciliation (1975). More will be said on this below.

²⁴⁸Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 204.

drawing. Next to the statement "Thank God He has thereby created a new humanity even out of our sinful flesh," Torrance inserts: "(cf II Clement!)." ²⁴⁹

Does Torrance then here affirm the fallen humanity of Christ? With Barth and Irving, Torrance asserts the importance of Christ's solidarity with fallen man in being made from the substance of a fallen Mary and living within a fallen context of weakness and judgment. It is further clear that he affirms with Barth and Irving that Christ struggled against sin.

However, under the influence of Mackintosh, Torrance is careful at the same time to eschew--to a degree that perhaps Barth and certainly Irving did not--all overtones of concupiscence and peccability on the part of the Saviour. With Mackintosh, he asserts that Christ's flesh was not sinful and, therefore, was not merely kept pure by the Holy Spirit, as taught by Irving. Instead, Christ's divine person had no fallen human will to drag it down, but only divine personality.

Perhaps most importantly, Torrance affirms that in assuming the flesh of Mary, the divine person of Christ sanctified this flesh in receiving it. This personal sanctification created out of fallen flesh a new humanity that is still his in heaven today and to which we can be joined by faith. To this limited degree at this early stage, Torrance cautiously affirms a doctrine of the fallen humanity of Christ: Christ assumed a fallen humanity and sanctified it in his person at the virginal conception.

²⁴⁹Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 204. Torrance studied II Clement for his doctoral dissertation: T. F. Torrance, The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers (Edinburgh and London: Olive and Boyd, 1948), 126-132. Perhaps Torrance has in mind II Clement 9.5 (see "An Ancient Christian Sermon [II Clement]" in The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations of their Writings, ed. and trans. J. B. Lightfoot and J. R. Harmer, ed. and rev. Michael W. Holmes [Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992, second edition], 115).

From the written record, it appears that Torrance may have retained his caution regarding the fallen humanity doctrine for some time. In his first article to mention the subject, Torrance stresses Christ's perfect humanity and his coming in likeness of sinful flesh rather than in sinful flesh itself.²⁵⁰ At the same time, in this article Torrance also stresses the close relation between the incarnation and the divine incognito, which is certainly one of the primary concerns driving Barth's interest in the fallen humanity of Christ doctrine.²⁵¹

With more detailed attention to the patristic couplet of anhypostasia and enhypostasia, as well as perhaps the non-assumptus, Torrance appears to shed his Apollinarian eggshells with their emphasis on Christ's lacking a human personality and will, which was apparently derived from Brunner and Forsyth's statements about Christ's divine personality.²⁵² Instead of his lacking a human will, Torrance soon affirms that Christ "bent the will of man in perfect submission to the Will of God."²⁵³ Furthermore, this moves Torrance to give an even more important role to his developing theme of the sanctification of Christ's flesh. Instead of explaining Christ's lack of original sin by the absence of a human personality and will, he now can link its

²⁵⁰Torrance, "Predestination in Christ," 128, 131.

²⁵¹Torrance, "Predestination in Christ," 141. More on Barth's doctrine of fallen humanity will be said in Chapter 4.

²⁵²Torrance gives closer attention to the patristic couplet in Torrance, "The Atonement and the Oneness of the Church," 249-250, 254-256. Harry Johnson, in his lengthy yet somewhat vague study of the fallen humanity of Christ, identifies this 1954 article as the first occasion in print in which Torrance asserts the fallen humanity of Christ doctrine. Johnson, 171-172.

²⁵³Torrance, "The Place of Christology in Biblical and Dogmatic Theology," 18.

absence to the divine person's sanctification of the fallen flesh from Mary.²⁵⁴

This development also allows the wedding of Torrance's theme of the sanctification of Christ's flesh to the active obedience of Christ:

He learned obedience by the things which He suffered, for that obedience from within our alienated humanity was a struggle with our sin and temptation; it had to be fought out with strong crying and tears and achieved in desperate anguish and weakness under the crushing load of the world's sin and the divine judgment. Throughout the whole course of His life He bent the will of man in perfect submission to the Will of God, bowing under the divine judgment against our unrighteousness, and offered a perfect obedience to the Father, that we might be redeemed and reconciled to Him.²⁵⁵

But the agency of the divine person on the human nature assumed is still Torrance's main emphasis:

By the *sanctification of our human nature* we refer to what was wrought by the Son, not only in his active and passive obedience, but through the *union* he established in his birth, life, death, and resurrection between our fallen human nature and his divine nature. In this union he both assumed our fallen human nature, taking it from the Virgin Mary, and sanctified it in the very act of assumption and all through his holy Life he lived in it from the beginning to the end.²⁵⁶

Thus, the sanctifying work of the divine person on the assumed humanity no longer takes place simply at the virginal conception, but is a matter of struggle throughout Christ's whole life.

Torrance also wields his fallen humanity teaching in polemic. Johnson

²⁵⁴Torrance, *School of Faith*, lxxxvi; Torrance, *The Christian Frame of Mind*, 10; and Torrance, "Incarnation and Atonement: Theosis and Henosis in the Light of Modern Scientific Rejection of Dualism," 5. More will be said on this later. For an interesting nineteenth-century parallel on original sin, but on a more forensic basis, see John Miller, *Was Christ in Adam?* (Princeton: Evangelical Reform Publications, 1887).

²⁵⁵Torrance, "The Place of Christology in Biblical and Dogmatic Theology," 18.

²⁵⁶Torrance, "Justification: Its Radical Nature and Place in Reformed Doctrine and Life," 231.

documents Torrance's early use of the doctrine in polemic against the Roman Catholic doctrine of the immaculate conception.²⁵⁷ In 1959 Torrance again stated opposition to the Roman Catholic doctrine of the immaculate conception on the basis of Christ's assuming fallen humanity.²⁵⁸ The distinctiveness of Torrance's development of the fallen humanity doctrine, however, may not be particularly highlighted by this polemic *per se*.²⁵⁹ However, the catchy phrase "the Latin heresy," with which he summarizes this polemic, can be an occasion for stressing Torrance's theme of the sanctification of fallen humanity by the divine person in the incarnation.²⁶⁰ At the same time, Torrance also retains his more positive emphasis upon the believer's sharing in Christ's new humanity.²⁶¹

By 1957, Torrance begins to express this theme of the definitive and progressive sanctification of Christ's flesh using the medical terminology of

²⁵⁷In July 1956 at the Working Committee of the World Council of Churches' Commission on Faith and Order, which met in Herrenalb, Germany, Torrance urged this doctrine against the immaculate conception. See Johnson, 172-173.

²⁵⁸Torrance, Conflict and Agreement, vol. 1, 149.

²⁵⁹For example, Torrance's longtime counterpart in theology at the Free Church College in Edinburgh, Rev. R. A. Finlayson, could also affirm the fallen humanity of Christ doctrine to this degree. See R. A. Finlayson, "Reformed Theological Writings," The Monthly Record of the Free Church of Scotland, November 1996, 241.

²⁶⁰Torrance, The Christian Frame of Mind, 9-10; and Torrance, "Karl Barth and the Latin Heresy," in Karl Barth, Biblical and Evangelical Theologian, 215-217. Guthridge specifically regrets Torrance's polemic edge against Roman Catholicism, which obscures more meaningful discussion of the theological issues involved (Guthridge, 410-417).

²⁶¹Torrance stresses our sharing in Christ's sanctified flesh repeatedly. For one example of a powerful application of this theme to Scottish theology, see Torrance, "Introduction" to The Mystery of the Lord's Supper, 33-35.

"healing."²⁶² While at first this medical model is employed sermonically and rhetorically, soon it takes on a more regular place in Torrance's description.²⁶³

Clearly then, Torrance's thoughts on the fallen humanity of Christ appear to be closely related to his embracing of the second theme highlighted at the close of his overview of Reformed christology: the non-assumptus.²⁶⁴ For example, in The Mediation of Christ, Torrance moves from the fallen humanity of Christ to the non-assumptus, with almost apologetic persuasion:

Perhaps the most fundamental truth which we have to learn in the Christian Church, or rather relearn since we have suppressed it, is that the Incarnation was the coming of God to save us in the heart of our *fallen* and *depraved* humanity, where humanity is at its wickedest in its enmity and violence against the reconciling love of God This is a doctrine found everywhere in the early Church in the first five centuries, expressed again and again in the terms that the whole man had to be assumed by Christ if the whole man was to be saved, that the unassumed is unhealed, or that what God has not taken up in

²⁶²Torrance's first use of this medical model identified in this study was sermonical: "When the Son of God came into this world He laid hold of our humanity which had gone astray and corrupted itself. He the Holy and Sinless One assumed our 'flesh of sin' in order that He might heal it, and turn it back to God, and restore it to communion with Him" (Torrance, When Christ Comes and Comes Again, 73). In debate on the floor of the 1958 Church of Scotland General Assembly, Torrance argued rhetorically using this medical model: "I think it is important to say that we cannot really understand the New Testament Teaching about spiritual healing unless we also look at the basic theological issues that are involved. . . . The primary one is that the Son of God has come into our world and taken upon Himself our frail and sick humanity, and in the very assumption of this flesh of sin He began the sanctification and healing" (Verbatim Minutes of General Assembly, 1958, 605-606).

²⁶³For example, see Torrance, The Mediation of Christ, 70.

²⁶⁴Perhaps Torrance's clearest statement on the fallen humanity of Christ doctrine was in a 1984 letter to the editor in the Monthly Record of the Free Church of Scotland. In this letter, Torrance clearly links his treatment of this doctrine to the non-assumptus: they were the two major and numbered points in Torrance's response to a previous editorial by Donald Macleod attacking Irving and Barth on the fallen humanity of Christ doctrine. See T. F. Torrance, Letter to the Editor, Monthly Record of the Free Church of Scotland, May 1984, 114.

Christ is not saved. The sharp point of those formulations of this truth lay in the fact that it is the alienated *mind* of a man that God had laid hold of in Jesus Christ in order to redeem it and effect reconciliation deep within the rational centre of human being.²⁶⁵

We have already noted Torrance's early reference to this concept in the margin to his Auburn christology lectures, but there the idea takes the form more of a passing comment than a well-developed idea. If Torrance intended to develop this concept in his christology, it was a task that went wanting for some time: the non-assumptus does not appear in his published record until 1975.²⁶⁶ The place of this theme at the center of his more mature presentation of his christology is clearly established, however, by the publication of The Mediation of Christ (1983), The Christian Frame of Mind (1984), and "Karl Barth and the Latin Heresy" (1986).²⁶⁷

²⁶⁵Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 39. Torrance traces the various expressions of this key doctrine in the writings of Irenaeus, Athanasius, Hilary, Gregory Nyssen, Gregory Nazianzen, Origen, Basil, Ambrose, and Cyril of Alexandria, among others (Torrance, Trinitarian Faith, 161-165). The Latin Church steadily began to reject this doctrine in the fifth century, which finally culminated in the development of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary (Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 39-40; Torrance, Conflict and Agreement, vol. 1, 149-151). This is the fullest form of Torrance's "Latin Heresy."

²⁶⁶Torrance, Theology in Reconciliation, 112, 154, 167. Chapters 3 and 4 in this book mention the theme. Though each chapter was based on a previous public lecture, in 1972 and 1974 respectively, these lectures may well have been filled out later for publication. See Torrance, Theology in Reconciliation, 3. Not only did our study find no earlier references in Torrance's printed corpus to the non-assumptus, but no citations in the exhaustive cataloguing by Kang pre-date this reference. This finding does on one level perhaps tend to qualify the direct importance of Athanasius and Gregory Nazianzen for Torrance's early development, as the non-assumptus is so closely associated with them later. For example, see Torrance, Trinitarian Faith, 163-164.

²⁶⁷Torrance, The Mediation of Christ (1983), 49; Torrance, The Christian Frame of Mind, 9; and T. F. Torrance, "Karl Barth and the Latin Heresy," Scottish Journal of Theology 39 (1986): 461-482. This latter article was later expanded for publication in Torrance, Karl Barth, Biblical and Evangelical Theologian, 213-240. Also, in 1978,

But Torrance's published record is not all that should be considered. After the Auburn marginal scribble, the next appearance of this patristic phrase is in Torrance's pre-1965 unpublished New College lectures.²⁶⁸ There the patristic phrase only occurs four times, one of which is merely in reference to Apollinarius.²⁶⁹

Of the more highly developed uses in his New College lectures, the first of these is in the christology overview lecture, from which our present outline of Torrance's christology is drawn:

Here the patristic doctrine of 'the unassumed is the unhealed', or 'what has not been taken up has not been saved', is given back its full place, and the incarnation and atonement are seen to interpenetrate each other. In the Incarnation, the Son of God entered into our estranged existence, taking upon himself the humanity that had become corrupted through sin, but in the very movement of assuming it and making it his own, he healed and sanctified it, so that in his perfect and sinless life our human nature is recreated and reconsecrated.²⁷⁰

Notice first that this treatment of the non-assumptus occurs not in the midst of detailed patristics studies, but in Torrance's section on Reformed christology where he is drawing conclusions from the communicatio operationum.²⁷¹ Also, note that Torrance

Torrance edited a set of articles for publication, one of which treated this theme: J. B. Torrance, "The Vicarious Humanity of Christ," in Incarnation, 140-141.

²⁶⁸Based on internal evidence, these lectures date between 1956 and 1965 (see Appendix 5). This patristic phrase does not occur in Torrance's unpublished 1956 draft report on baptism in the early church housed in the New College Library (T. F. Torrance, "The Church of Scotland Special Commission on Baptism Draft of Interim Report 1956, Containing Detailed References and Supporting Material Not Included in the Printed Report to the General Assembly, Prepared by The Reverend Professor Thomas F. Torrance, M.B.E., D.Theol., D.D., Convener").

²⁶⁹Torrance, "The Patristic Doctrine of Christ," 8.

²⁷⁰Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 4.

²⁷¹Again, as was the case with Torrance's development of anhypostasia and enhypostasia, this tends to relativize the importance of the precise patristic origins of

is here using the patristic phrase as an adage on which to hang previously developed themes: the relation between incarnation and atonement, Christ's fallen context, Christ's assuming fallen humanity, Christ's sanctifying this fallen humanity in his divine person, and Christ's sinless perfection. The same is true of the other two more expansive uses of this patristic phrase in the New College lectures.²⁷²

The non-assumptus does, however, add theological value to this previous cluster of christological themes on a number of levels. First, it reinforces, or perhaps even originates, the medical model we previously saw Torrance beginning to use. This theme of healing also perhaps tends to stress the internal nature of Christ's sanctifying of fallen humanity in his incarnation. In addition, to the degree that the non-assumptus functions as an abbreviated version of salvation history in Torrance's theology, it perhaps tends to concisely accentuate the anhypostatic strand over against a more forensic approach.²⁷³

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the non-assumptus provides a simple and clear didactic vehicle for presenting Torrance's incarnational theology. If anhypostasia and enhypostasia are notable for their infrequent direct appearance in Torrance's early writings, the non-assumptus is notable for its frequent appearance in

this concept for our purposes here.

²⁷²Interestingly, Torrance's treatment in the overview lecture is more expansive than these other two occurrences: Torrance, "The Hypostatic Union," 8; and Torrance, "The Patristic Doctrine of Christ," 3.

²⁷³Torrance, The Christian Frame of Mind, 10.

his later writings.²⁷⁴ The soteriological implications are especially highlighted, as is its pastristic pedigree:

This soteriological principle, that only what the incarnate Son has taken up from us into himself is saved, had been earlier enunciated by Origen, but now reinforced by Athanasius, it was given a central place in the teaching of the Cappadocian theologians.²⁷⁵

This is, indeed, a persuasive patristic imprimatur. To this list of advocates, Torrance adds Karl Barth, whom he sees as being instrumental in again calling the attention of the Western church to the non-assumptus.²⁷⁶

²⁷⁴For example, to mention only a few, see Torrance, "The Atonement: The Singularity of Christ and the Finality of the Cross: The Atonement and the Moral Order," 237; Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 39; Torrance, Karl Barth, Biblical and Evangelical Theologian, 231-234; Torrance, Trinitarian Faith, 161-165; Torrance, The Christian Frame of Mind, 9-10; Torrance, Letter to the Editor, 114; and Torrance, Theology in Reconciliation, 112, 154, 167.

²⁷⁵Torrance, Trinitarian Faith, 163. Concerning the patristic heritage of the non-assumptus, Torrance also notes: "Before we go on to discuss these questions further, however, we must consider another fact pointed out by Athanasius, that when the Lord for our sake became man it was impossible that the body he possessed should lack either soul or mind, for salvation pertains to the whole man, and it would be a myth if it extended to the body only. That is the very point variously expressed by Gregory of Nazianzus and Cyril of Alexandria: 'the unassumed is the unhealed', 'what has not been taken up has not been saved'" (Torrance, Theology in Reconciliation, 112). Torrance concludes about the Western church: "It is unfortunate, and very astonishing, that Latin theology never really appreciated the profound implications of the Greek Patristic principle that 'the unassumed is the unhealed'" (Torrance, The Christian Frame of Mind, 9-10). Hence, Torrance uses the title, the "Latin Heresy." This soteriological usage of the non-assumptus is in addition to the typical Anti-Apollinarian sense in which it is taken. See Trevor Hart, "Two Models of Salvation in Relation to Christological Understanding in the Patristic East" (Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1989), 161; and Macleod, "Christology," 175.

²⁷⁶For a comprehensive treatment of this subject, see "Chapter 8: Karl Barth and the Latin Heresy" in Torrance, Karl Barth, Biblical and Evangelical Theologian, 213-240. This is a fuller version of an earlier article: T. F. Torrance, "Karl Barth and the Latin Heresy," Scottish Journal of Theology 39 (1986): 461-482. Note, however, that Barth does not use the term non-assumptus and that here Torrance argues more conceptually for its importance in Barth's corpus.

Thus, from the vantage of our wider, genetic study of Torrance's christology, it is clear that the non-assumptus is more an effective vehicle for the presentation and accentuation of a number of earlier themes than it is anything radically new in Torrance's developing christology.

Reconstructed Christology

The denouement of T. F. Torrance's New College overview lecture on christology lays out before his students the future of modern theology:

Today there is needed a reconstruction of the whole classical doctrine of Christ in such a way as to bring together the Patristic emphasis on the incarnation and the Reformation stress upon the atonement, and thus to gather up and do justice to the deepening insight of the Church throughout history into the person and work of Christ.²⁷⁷

On which specific theological topics does Torrance propose to focus?

This calls for a rethinking of the incarnation in its relation to the creation of space and time, and the development of relational (ontological and dynamic) concepts together with the formation of appropriate cognitive tools with which to carry this through. This is the task of theology in the era of objective ecumenicism in which we seek to find a way of advancing forward to a scientific theology in which concepts of theology at work within space and time are closer to the concepts of our understanding of the created universe as it unfolds to our inquiries within space and time.²⁷⁸

Finally, Torrance stresses the importance of future development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit:

It does not seem possible, then, to undertake a very radical reconstruction of

²⁷⁷Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 4.

²⁷⁸Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 4-5. Torrance's term "era of objective ecumenicism" is elsewhere specifically tied to living in a time after Karl Barth (see Torrance, "The Incarnate Life of the Son in the Union of His Divine and Human Natures," 18; McPake, 11). The wordings of the endings of these two lectures is strikingly similar.

the whole doctrine of Christ without a far deeper and more exacting pneumatology.²⁷⁹

The degree to which Torrance fulfilled this agenda will be judged retrospectively.

Thus ends Torrance's overview of christology.

Now we have surveyed Torrance's christology by tracing key lines of its genetic development using his own outline of presentation. It is clear that he begins by taking the approach inherited from his native Scotland in the persons of H. R. Mackintosh and P. T. Forsyth: probing the interrelation between Christ's person and work. The Father-Son relation is fundamental in Torrance's thought and is an obvious point where he shows us that his concern is more to develop theology than merely do patristic studies. Approaching the hypostatic union as a theological disclosure model, Torrance presses this christological analogy into the service of his developing doctrines of revelation and reconciliation, while staying in constant touch with his Scottish roots and Continental influences. The contributions of Barth, Mackintosh, Forsyth, Brunner, Dale, Campbell, Maurice, and Carlyle have all been noted.

Drawing a proper doctrine of anhypostasis and enhypostasis from Barth, Torrance structures his complex of christological themes under this twin patristic couplet. Anhypostasia is developed into the rubric under which the virgin birth and the once for all union of Christ with man in creational solidarity is considered, while enhypostasia is developed into the rubric under which the continuous union of Christ with his fellow men is considered in light of Campbell's twin headings.

When reflecting on Reformed christology in particular, Torrance elaborates on

²⁷⁹Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 5.

the utility of the communicatio operationum in a more modern context for showing that Christ's humanity is not merely instrumental to his person. He relates this development to the twin patristic couplet previously considered, highlighting that in this light anhypostasia stresses the general humanity of Christ, while enhypostasia stresses the particular humanity of Christ. Thus, the person of Christ has a unique hold upon humanity and relationship with it. This more fully developed form of theological algebra or set of theological spectacles provides two major strands from which Torrance's more mature christology is woven.

In response to Barth's commendation of Edward Irving for his doctrine of Christ's sinful humanity, Torrance recoils, siding instead with H. R. Mackintosh and the body of Scottish opinion that the Holy Spirit was not needed to make Christ impeccable. Christ's humanity was made pure by his person, Torrance proposes. In his more mature christology, this sanctification of Mary's fallen seed by the divine person--treated using his well-developed anhypostatic and enhypostatic rubrics--kept original sin from the Saviour and makes impossible the Roman Catholic doctrine of the immaculate conception. Even in his Auburn lectures, Torrance links this incarnational sanctification with the non-assumptus, but he does not appear to develop this idea until much later in his career. When it does appear, the non-assumptus is more a vehicle for communicating and highlighting a cluster of themes already present in Torrance's christology, rather than developing new ones.

Union with Christ

With our general overview of T. F. Torrance's philosophical and theological background completed, as well as a genetic survey of his developing christological

thought, we are now in a position to more fully grasp his doctrine of carnal union with Christ. Torrance's earliest comment on the doctrine of union with Christ, indirect though it be, has already passed before our eyes from his 1939 Auburn christology lectures:

Thank God He has thereby created a new humanity even out of our sinful flesh and has placed it eternally in the heaven. And in our faith we are hid with Christ in God, assimilated to Him, recreated anew in Him, the Man who is Mediator between God and man, the Captain of our Salvation. Let no man think crudely or contemptibly of the humanity of Christ made sin for us, but let no man think it to be any more than Human, for it was not.²⁸⁰

While the hypostatic union is clearly an important category to the young theologian, this early emphasis upon faith union does not show signs of a clear integration with it. In 1941, Torrance does not yet relate the doctrines of union with Christ and creation as deeply as he later will.²⁸¹

However, by 1948 his thought has grown, and he begins to explore the eschatological relation between Christ and the Christian in light of his maturing christological analogy.²⁸² In 1954, Torrance clearly identifies an "ontological union with Christ Himself" in his developing christology.²⁸³ Thus, our task now is to trace

²⁸⁰Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 204.

²⁸¹T. F. Torrance, "Theology and the Common Man," *Life and Work* 12 (1941): 177: "... when we are ingrafted into Christ, it is an operation 'contrary to nature.'"

²⁸²Torrance, "Concerning the Ministry," 200-201: "Thus the Christian must be regarded as perfect in Christ, and as such he is hid with Christ in God; but as a visible psychological personality, he is still *peccator*. To attempt to resolve this quasi-hypostatic or eschatological relation into a process of union in which man is gradually made more and more just and divine, is to flout the 'without fusion and without confusion' of *Chalcedon*."

²⁸³Guthridge notes that Torrance moved beyond forensic and relational categories to ontological ones by 1952 (Guthridge, 206).

the maturing development of Torrance's doctrine of union with Christ, and more particularly his doctrine of carnal union with Christ.

Carnal Union with Christ

In the printed form of his 1951 Croall Lectures delivered at New College in Edinburgh, the Scottish theologian George S. Hendry dealt directly with the doctrine of union with Christ--especially incarnational union--while contrasting the Eastern and Western understandings of Christ's consubstantiality with humankind.²⁸⁴ For our purposes in this chapter, the accuracy of Hendry's perception of Chalcedonian christology and its Western counterpart is not the critical issue.²⁸⁵ The response Hendry provokes from T. F. Torrance on carnal union with Christ certainly is.

Treating John Calvin's formulation of the incarnation in Book II of his Institutes of the Christian Religion, Hendry finds "language that reveals a profound sympathy with ancient patristic formulations" and "profound significance" attached to

²⁸⁴George S. Hendry, The Gospel of the Incarnation (London: SCM Press, 1959), 68-71. The printed form of these lectures was first published in America by Westminster Press in 1958. In chapters three and four Hendry contrasts the views of four Eastern theologians--Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Hilary of Poitiers, and Cyril of Alexandria--with that of three Western theologians--Anselm, Thomas Aquinas, and John Calvin.

²⁸⁵According to Hendry, the Eastern doctrine of Christ's consubstantiality with man, enshrined at the Council of Chalcedon, is that Christ's humanity "was conceived not merely as individual, but as generic or universal; its assumption by the eternal Son at the incarnation was understood to mean, not merely that he became a man, like other men, but that in some sense he became *man*; he entered into some kind of ontological relation with humanity as a whole" (Hendry, 59). Theologians in the West misunderstood this doctrine, merely interpreting "the *homo-ousia*, or consubstantiality, of the incarnate Lord with our manhood as consanguinity or community of descent" (Hendry, 65). Hendry goes on to propose his own less metaphysical integration of the incarnation and atonement after contrasting the Eastern and Western views of the incarnation.

Christ's consubstantiality with man.²⁸⁶

In all of this Calvin appears to be laying an objective foundation for the vicariousness of the work of Christ.²⁸⁷

But then something changes dramatically:

When we turn to the third book of the *Institutes*, however, we note with surprise that not a trace of it remains. The Christ who, we learned earlier, came and joined himself to us and took our nature and put on the person of Adam in order that he might act for us, has now got separated from us and is outside us, and so long as he remains so, "all that he suffered and achieved for the salvation of the human race is of no avail and no significance to us. To communicate to us what he has received from the Father he must become ours and dwell in us."²⁸⁸

This shocking divorce of human beings from Christ is incompatible with Hendry's construction of an Eastern view of Christ's consubstantiality with man.

Hendry is firm in his conclusion that this shift from Book II to Book III of the *Institutes* means that the latter union described by Calvin is not included in the former:

Calvin is not here referring back to the relation established by the incarnation of Christ in our nature, as a reader of his words might be justified in supposing. He is introducing an entirely new theme, the union of Christ and believers, as head and members in his body, the church.²⁸⁹

This new theme is

²⁸⁶Hendry, 68-69. Charles Partee also sees in Calvin this same theme: "Calvin seems to have understood the union with Christ in the ontological terms of Greek patristic thought rather than the imitation of Christ in the mystical terms of medieval thought" (Partee, "Calvin, Calvinism, and Philosophy: A Prolusion," 133). Partee does not expand upon this fleeting comment.

²⁸⁷Hendry, 69.

²⁸⁸Hendry, 69. Hendry is quoting from Calvin, *Institutes* (1559), III.1.1 (1:537) [CO 2:393-394]. Hendry is not alone in his disappointment with Calvin's treatment of union with Christ in Book III. See Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics* IV/3.2, 553.

²⁸⁹Hendry, 69-70.

a different union from that which was established between Christ and humanity by the incarnation. The incarnate union was based on Christ's possession of a common nature with us; the union of which Calvin now speaks is based on the gift of the Holy Spirit²⁹⁰

Hendry sees even Calvin's repeated stress on spiritual union as proof of this fact--a strong emphasis on the one union empties meaning from the other.²⁹¹ Thus, incarnational and spiritual union are different moments in Calvin's theology.²⁹²

In October 1951 the newest member of the Divinity Faculty at New College--Church History Professor T. F. Torrance--was doubtless stirred by Hendry's provocative study. After the printed form of Hendry's lectures first appeared in 1958, Torrance responds to his comments on John Calvin with both praise and rebuttal in the long introduction to his work published the next year, The School of Faith.²⁹³ Unlike

²⁹⁰Hendry, 69-70. Van Buren echoes this conviction: "There is no identity in Calvin's theology between Christ and Christians; the distinction remains in a union that is activated and realized solely from the side of Christ. The common nature which we have with Christ, but which was not in itself sufficient to create this union, is made the basis of union by the action of the Holy Spirit." Van Buren, 100.

²⁹¹Hendry, 70: "As we read what Calvin has to say about spiritual union between Christ and his church--and this is a theme on which he loves to dilate--it becomes difficult to believe that any meaning is left to the natural relation between Christ and humanity of which he spoke in the earlier context."

²⁹²Hendry also lists two other features of Calvin's thought that force him to conclude the incarnation and the believer's union with Christ are separate themes. First, for Calvin election is "not by community of nature, but by the inscrutable divine decree" (Hendry, 70). Second, in his polemic against Osiander, Calvin "refused to entertain the thought that our nature was transformed in consequence of its having been worn by Christ, and insisted that what Christ accomplished for us becomes ours only by imputation" (Hendry, 70). These two points are not, however, expanded upon in Hendry's study.

²⁹³Torrance, School of Faith, xi-cxxvi. This introduction is one of the most succinct presentations of Torrance's own christocentric theology. As with most of his works, especially his earlier ones, there are few footnotes to guide the researcher to his sources. Hendry is specifically mentioned several times in this introduction and quietly

Hendry, Torrance finds in Calvin not two kinds of union with Christ but only one.²⁹⁴

Torrance discusses the issues raised by Hendry by returning to his Scottish roots. This move by Torrance is hardly surprising, since during this period he was perusing Scottish theology as convenor of the Church of Scotland Special Commission on Baptism.²⁹⁵ As related previously in our Introduction, Torrance notes a two-fold union with Christ in John Craig's Catechism of 1581: one a "carnal union" with Christ and the other a "spiritual union" with Christ.²⁹⁶ The New College theologian, however, questions this division:

Is the spiritual union another union, a union in addition to our carnal union with Christ, or is it a sharing in the one and only union between God and man wrought out in Jesus Christ? That is a very important

assumed in the background on many other occasions. For example, specific references to Hendry are given on pages lxxx, lxxxi, and xcv. Hendry's name is misspelled "Henry" on p. cxiii, and the citation in The Gospel of the Incarnation should read page 54, not page 5. Hendry's treatment of Calvin cited on page lxxx is also in view on pages lxxxix-xc of Torrance's work, although it is not referenced. The only modern theologian explicitly cited by Torrance more often than Hendry is his former Basel mentor, Karl Barth.

²⁹⁴We shall return to Torrance's treatment of Calvin's doctrine of union with Christ in Chapter 3. Our present interest is more to follow Torrance's response to Hendry and trace the positive development of Torrance's doctrine of union with Christ from that point.

²⁹⁵Under Torrance's leadership this commission, which ran for some ten years, conducted a sweeping study of the doctrine of infant baptism from the prototon to the eschaton. For Torrance's dominant role in drafting the interim reports of this commission, see "Verbatim Minutes of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1958," Office of the Principal Clerk, Church of Scotland, 1151. The particular report covering Scottish theology is "Interim Report of the Special Commission on Baptism," Minutes of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland (May 1958). More recently, Torrance has again turned to Scottish studies. See Torrance, Scottish Theology.

²⁹⁶Torrance, School of Faith, cvi-cvii. See also Torrance, Scottish Theology, 51-52.

question, for if the spiritual union is an additional union, then our salvation depends not only on the finished work of Christ but upon something else as well which has later to be added on to it before it is real for us.²⁹⁷

Rejecting Craig's notion of double union with Christ, Torrance goes on to rebut:

As against that grave aberration it must be insisted that there is only one union with Christ, that which He has wrought out with us in His birth and life and death and resurrection and in which He gives us to share through the gift of His Spirit. The difference between these two views may appear very slight indeed at this point, but the implications of this difference are very far-reaching especially in the whole sphere of the life and work of the Church, in the doctrine of grace, and in our understanding of the Sacraments.²⁹⁸

Torrance asserts that a shift on this doctrine took place between the time of Calvin and the Westminster Assembly.²⁹⁹

On this historic Scottish basis, Torrance takes up his case against Hendry. In his argument, Hendry had previously asserted:

... but it could hardly be said that human beings have no being apart from Christ as man.³⁰⁰

However, since it is human nature that is assumed in hypostatic union with the divine Logos--instead of, for example, angelic nature--Torrance sees a relationship of being existing between each individual human being and Christ as man:

Now this carries with it the implication "that human beings have no being apart from Christ as man" (which Dr. Henry [sic] rejects, *The Gospel of the*

²⁹⁷Torrance, School of Faith, cvii.

²⁹⁸Torrance, School of Faith, cvii-cviii.

²⁹⁹For discussion of how Calvin's treatment of the Lord's Supper in his catechism holds to the primacy of the carnal union while Westminster does not, see Torrance, School of Faith, cvii-cviii, and Torrance, God and Rationality, 64-5.

³⁰⁰Hendry, 54.

Incarnation, p. 5 [sic]). If Christ had not come, if the Incarnation had not taken place, and if things between man and God had been and are allowed to take their course as a result of man's estrangement from God and God's judgement upon man, man would disappear into nothing. It belongs to the nature of sin that it is alienation from God, and therefore that it is alienation from the source of all being in the Creator.³⁰¹

Torrance is quoting from Hendry, but turning his negative impossibility into an important positive christological reality.

Torrance further elaborates on the nature of this Christ-humankind bond elsewhere in his lengthy introduction:

... [T]he eternal Son and Word of God is He in whom all men cohere for He is the Creator who gives them being and through His Spirit holds them in being. There is thus an ontological relation between the creature and the Creator reposing upon His sheer grace, in which He gives them being as realities distinct from Himself, so that the ontological relation, as Barth has so clearly and decisively shown, is not reversible. That is, the Son and Word of God became man by becoming one particular man, but because He is the Creator Word who became Man, even as the incarnate Word He still holds all men in an ontological relation to Himself. That relation was not broken off with the Incarnation.³⁰²

On the basis of this creational bond between human beings and the one who has become incarnate, Torrance concludes:

... all men are involved already objectively in His human life and in His work in life and death, i.e. not only on judicial and transactional grounds, but on the ground of the constitution of His Person as Mediator.³⁰³

This universal incarnational union Torrance identifies with Scottish Reformer John Craig's terminology of "carnal union," describing more his own broader development of union with Christ--which includes not only the hypostatic union but also spiritual

³⁰¹Torrance, *School of Faith*, cxiii. The passage cited is from Hendry, 54.

³⁰²Torrance, *School of Faith*, cxi-cxii. Torrance gives no references from Barth.

³⁰³Torrance, *School of Faith*, cxiii.

union--than Craig's double union, to which he had objected previously.

Does Torrance have a place for the Holy Spirit in his thinking? As an actualizing agent, he has an explicit place:

Thus the Communion of the Spirit has to be understood as correlative to the union of God and man wrought out in the Life and Work of Jesus Christ. This is fundamental to all that these Catechisms have to teach about the work of the Spirit in God's people as actualizing subjectively in them what has been accomplished for them once and for all objectively in the Incarnation.³⁰⁴

On the ground of our ontological, carnal union connection to Christ as man established in his incarnation, which Torrance terms "objective union," the Holy Spirit makes the incarnational union a subjective reality in our daily experience. Instead of Craig's two separate unions, Torrance sees one union with Christ, including objective and subjective aspects.

Thus, Torrance sees in the doctrine of union with Christ a universal union with all men via the incarnation, whereby they are in Christ. He is persuaded that incarnational union with Christ includes the actual content of spiritual union, objectively involving all humankind. This understanding produces no dogmatic division between carnal and spiritual union with Christ in Torrance's thought: there is only one union with Christ.

This carnal union with Christ is clearly provocative--not just the term but the theological concept. But what further elaboration does Torrance give? What wider

³⁰⁴Torrance, School of Faith, cvi. Torrance also points to the role of the Spirit: "Thus it may be said that the 'objective' union which we have with Christ through his incarnational assumption of our humanity to himself is 'subjectively' actualized in us through his indwelling Spirit, 'we in Christ' and 'Christ in us' thus complementing and interpenetrating each other" (Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 77).

christological and theological basis does Torrance provide for this dogmatic assertion of carnal union with Christ? Having traced Torrance's development of anhypostasia and enhypostasia, we can employ the two lenses of this set of christological spectacles to appreciate more deeply Torrance's doctrine of carnal or incarnational union with Christ. Each rubric contributes to our knowledge of the relation between the incarnate Christ and humankind.

Anhypostasia and Enhypostasia Revisited

At the close of our examination of Torrance's New College lecture "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," we promised to revisit the topic of our solidarity with Christ based on Torrance's development of anhypostasia and enhypostasia.³⁰⁵

Torrance's lecture on Reformed christology continues for another page, and the conclusions he draws are germane to the heart of our study. Having heard him assert Christ's solidarity with humankind, we listen for Torrance to say more about the nature of this crucial solidarity.

Torrance begins the final section of his lecture noting the utility of his couplet for tracing Christ's solidarity with humankind.³⁰⁶ His first conclusion uncovers again the creational aspect of incarnational union with Christ:

(a) The Incarnation was the Incarnation of the Creator Word, by whom all men are made, and in whom all men cohere, with our human flesh in Jesus. Here we have the union of the Universal Word and the one human creature, created by that Word which makes Jesus at once Man, and a Man. Is that not the deepest

³⁰⁵Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 9.

³⁰⁶"It is in this connection that we are helped [by anhypostasia and enhypostasia] to see the solidarity of Jesus Christ with all men in His reconciling work" (Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 9).

significance [sic] of the expression 'Son of Man'?³⁰⁷

Torrance's line of logic is clear: he highlights the creator Logos, who made all humans and in whom they cohere. Since this same creator Logos has become incarnate with our human flesh, he is both "Man, and a Man."³⁰⁸ Torrance sees this double nature of the incarnate one expressed in the "Son of Man" title from the Gospels.³⁰⁹

Oddly, Torrance begins drawing his second conclusion with an almost psychological description of anhypostasia, but his intent is more to forswear any hint of human "independence" than revert to a mistaken notion of his favorite patristic couplet.³¹⁰ But what does it mean for the creator to "assume that which unites us with one another, the possession of the same or common human nature"? By way of a

³⁰⁷Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 9.

³⁰⁸Trook calls this the Mackintoshian synthesis: "The nature of this consubstantial union is elaborated by Torrance's mentor, H. R. Mackintosh. He dispells the dualism inherent between the universal/particular differentiation. Frequently Torrance reiterates the Mackintoshian synthesis--Christ was not only Man (in the universal sense), but equally and also a man (man in the particular sense)" (Trook, 60). For Mackintosh's use of this phrase and its original context, see Mackintosh, 385-386. Torrance repeats this phrase elsewhere: "In the Incarnation the eternal Son assumed human nature into oneness with Himself but in that assumption Jesus Christ is not only real man but a man. He is at once the *One* and the *Many*" (Torrance, "The Atonement and the Oneness of the Church," 249-250). For more on "the One and the Many," see Torrance, "The Continuous Union in the Historical Life and Obedience of Jesus," 1-3.

³⁰⁹Torrance's use of "the Son of Man" expression from the Gospels to identify and confirm this idea is perhaps drawn from Hendry, 107ff. J. B. Torrance also explicitly links the "Son of Man" title to anhypostasia and enhypostasia (J. B. Torrance, "The Priesthood of Jesus," 164-165).

³¹⁰(b) In the doctrine of the Anhypostasia we state that the Son did not join Himself to an independent personality existing on its own as an individual. That is, He so took possession of human nature, as to set aside that which divides us men from one another, our independent centres of personality, and to assume that which unites us with one another, the possession of the same or common human nature" (Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 9).

contrast, Torrance makes the nature of this solidarity more plain:

But apart from the doctrine of enhypostasia in addition to that, that could only mean a solidarity between Christ and all men which was, so to speak, only ontological and therefore physical and mechanical--a causal and necessitarian solidarity.³¹¹

As Torrance has developed it, anhypostasia singularly implies "a causal and necessitarian solidarity," the nature of which Torrance labels as "only ontological and therefore physical and mechanical." But Torrance quickly adds:

The doctrine of enhypostasia insists that within that anhypostatic solidarity of Christ with our common human nature, He came also as an individual human being in our humanity, seeking in addition a solidarity in terms of the interaction of persons within our human and social life, in personal relations of love, commitment, responsibility, decision, etc.³¹²

Thus, on the one hand, considered from the rubric of anhypostasia, Jesus and all other humans are in a necessary, ontological solidarity because he is their incarnate creator.

On the other hand, considered from the rubric of enhypostasia, Jesus is one human being among many others, relating to them, interacting with them more in personal terms. These two ideas must be held together for a clear picture of the person and work of Christ.

This same line of argument has been given by Torrance since he first began discussing anhypostasia and enhypostasia. In his first article to treat the couplet, Torrance used it to critique the view of the atonement advocated by Gustav Aulen's Christus Victor:

If *anhypostasia* alone were to be applied to the atonement then Aulen's view would be right and proper, but that would mean that the deed of atonement

³¹¹Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 9.

³¹²Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 9.

would be a pure act of God over the head of man and not an atoning act involving incorporation. Certainly the atonement is act of God, supremely act of God, but that act of God is incarnated in human flesh, giving the human full place within the divine action issuing forth out of man's life.³¹³

Interestingly, this same line of christological logic was repeated by Torrance's younger brother, J. B. Torrance, but in slightly more detail.³¹⁴ The older Torrance brother has

³¹³Torrance, "The Atonement and the Oneness of the Church," 250. For other lines of critique of Aulen's work, see Symeon Rodger, "The Soteriology of Anselm of Canterbury, An Orthodox Perspective," Greek Orthodox Theological Review 34 (1989): 19-43; William P. Loewe, "Irenaeus' Soteriology: Christus Victor Revisited," Anglican Theological Review 67 (1985): 1-15; Colin Gunton, "Christus Victor Revisited: A Study in Metaphor and the Transformation of Meaning," Journal of Theological Studies 36 (1985): 129-145; Ted Peters, "The Atonement in Anselm and Luther: Second Thoughts About Gustaf Aulen's Christus Victor," Lutheran Quarterly 24 (1972): 301-314; Eugene R. Fairweather, "Incarnation and Atonement: An Anselmian Response to Aulen's Christus Victor," Canadian Journal of Theology 7 (1961): 167-175; and George O. Evenson, "Critique of Aulen's Christus Victor," Concordia Theological Monthly 28 (1957): 738-749.

³¹⁴In an article for a 1956 Festschrift volume for Karl Barth, to which both brothers contributed, J. B. Torrance states: "A clear example of a one-sided emphasis of this kind comes in Gustav Aulen's influential book, *Christus Victor*. In reaction to a semi-Pelagian view where the emphasis is placed too exclusively on the work of Jesus as man, Aulen argues for what he calls a 'classic' or 'dramatic' doctrine of the Atonement" (J. B. Torrance, "The Priesthood of Jesus," 158-159). The younger Torrance then continues, applying our theological couplet: "In other words, this is a doctrine of Atonement which, while seeking to do justice to the *anhypostasia* of Christology, fails to do justice to *enhypostasia*. The opposite extreme which Aulen seeks to avoid at all costs is an overemphasis of *enhypostasia* and the humanity of Jesus which fails to do justice to *anhypostasia*, that God was in Christ. Here again we can see how these twin conceptions must be held together" (J. B. Torrance, "The Priesthood of Jesus," 160). What remedy does J. B. Torrance propose for this set of overemphases of this patristic couplet? "In so far as no one analogy expresses the whole truth, our correct procedure must be that of comparing analogy with analogy, Scripture with Scripture, until we reach a deeper understanding" (J. B. Torrance, "The Priesthood of Jesus," 161). Thus, the twin concepts of *anhypostasia* and *enhypostasia* must be integrated when used analogously in describing the atonement. However, the younger Torrance brother does not specify what controls this process of integration. Interestingly, J. B. Torrance also here links *anhypostasia* and *enhypostasia* to John McLeod Campbell (J. B. Torrance, "The Priesthood of Jesus," 164-165).

also repeated this line of critique later in life.³¹⁵

The third and final point Torrance makes when considering the interaction of anhypostasia and enhypostasia in his lecture on Reformed christology is about original sin:

(c) The doctrine of anhypostasia and enhypostasia (put together as one concept) helps us also to understand how God the Son was made in the likeness of our flesh of sin, and yet was not himself a sinner; how he became one with us in continuity of our Adamic and fallen existence in such a way as to make contact with us in the very roots of our sin, and yet did not himself repeat our 'original sin' but vanquished it, and broke its continuity within our human nature which He assumed. He assumed our corrupt and estranged humanity, but in such a way as at the same time to heal and sanctify in Himself what He assumed.³¹⁶

Torrance ends his Reformed christology lecture by detailing the importance of each half of this ancient patristic couplet for the sinlessness of Christ:

The act of anhypostatic assumption speaks of God's gracious and amazingly humble act in assuming our humanity in the concrete likeness of the flesh of sin, but within that enhypostasia speaks of the fact that the person of Christ was the person of the obedient Son of the Father, who remained in perfect holy communion with the Father from the very beginning, and so was sinless and absolutely pure and spotless and holy. Thus He, the enhypostatic Son of Man, lived out a life of perfect and sinless obedience to the Father in the midst our fallen human nature, which He anhypostatically assumed, and in virtue of which

³¹⁵"This way of connecting redemption with the incarnation has sometimes been decried as the 'physical theory' of redemption, with the implication that it is merely through the physical union of the divine Logos with decaying humanity that the salvation of the human race is brought about. In this connection reference is regularly made to the Athanasian statement: 'He became man that we might be made divine.' To put it simply like that, however, as if the incarnation by itself effects man's redemption, is a serious misrepresentation, for it overlooks the fact that as the incarnate Logos Christ acts *personally* on our behalf, and that he does that from within the ontological depths of our human existence which he has penetrated and gathered up in himself" (Torrance, Trinitarian Faith, 156).

³¹⁶Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 10.

Jesus Christ entered into solidarity with all men.³¹⁷

Thus, we have Christ anhypostatically and enhypostatically considered.

Anhypostatic Solidarity

This "anhypostatic solidarity" or description of the solidarity between Christ and humankind that flows from the "act of anhypostatic assumption" and is at the heart of Torrance's doctrine of carnal or incarnational union with Christ is not an unknown theme in his wider writings. Thus, elsewhere, Torrance expands on the nature of this anhypostatic solidarity.

First, Torrance identifies this solidarity between the humanity of the incarnate Christ and humankind as unique.³¹⁸ To explain the uniqueness of this anhypostatic solidarity, Torrance returns to anhypostasia, pointing to the Logos' unique hold on his humanity:

Therefore from the enhypostasia we have to go back again to the anhypostasia and say this: while the Son of God assumed our human nature, and became fully and really like us, nevertheless, His full and complete human nature was united to God in a unique way, (hypostatically in one person) as our human nature is not, and will never be. Therefore He is unlike us, not unlike us as to the humanity of His human nature, but in the unique union of His human nature to the Divine nature in the One Person of God the Son. (This is the baffling element in the Virgin Birth, which tells us that while it is our very human nature He assumed, He did not assume it in the way we share in it, because He took it in a unique relation with His Deity). But it is upon the unique, hypostatic relation of His human nature to His divine nature, that the truth of our human nature depends, for we are in union and communion with God, as we share in

³¹⁷Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 10.

³¹⁸"Here was a human life unlike all other human lives in its relation to them, for here they were confronted in what was undoubtedly human and historical with something ultimate and final . . ." (Torrance, "The Continuous Union in the Historical Life and Obedience of Jesus," 13).

His human nature, which is hypostatically united to God.³¹⁹

Christ's human nature is united to him differently than ours: his is in hypostatic union with his divine person. Thus, there is a line of continuity between us in this anhypostatic solidarity--we are both human. However, there is also a clear line of discontinuity--and here is where the unique anhypostatic factor lies: his humanity is hypostatically united to his divine person, but ours is not. Upon this difference "the truth of our human nature depends."

The Logos, as creator and sustainer of all human beings, is the ontological ground of all humanity. It is this Logos who has become incarnate:

Since it is in God by whom we have been created that we live and move and have our being, it is in God become man, in the Lord Jesus, that we live and move and have our being--every human being is ontologically bound to him.³²⁰

Again:

In Jesus Christ the very Word of God through whom all things were created and who is the life and light of men, has himself become man, thus embodying in his humanity the creative source of all human being.³²¹

And again, Torrance identifies Christ's humanity as the ontological ground of each human being:

Because in Jesus Christ human nature is perfectly and indivisibly united to God the Creator, he constitutes in his humanity the ontological source and ground

³¹⁹Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 9.

³²⁰Torrance, "The Atonement: The Singularity of Christ and the Finality of the Cross: The Atonement and the Moral Order," 244. This theme is echoed in Torrance, "Incarnation and Atonement: Theosis and Henosis in the Light of Modern Scientific Rejection of Dualism," 6.

³²¹Torrance, "The Goodness and Dignity of Man in the Christian Tradition," 316.

of the being of every man and woman³²²

Torrance identifies not just Christ's hold on humanity but his humanity itself as the unique, creative point between us. As the unique creator, in the hypostatic union his humanity is the ontological ground of humanity and, thus, unique in nature.

In addition, Torrance's wider corpus stresses that this anhypostatic solidarity is universal in scope:

. . . all men are involved already objectively in His human life and in His work in life and death, i.e. not only on judicial and transactional grounds, but on the ground of the constitution of His Person as Mediator.³²³

All humans enjoy this ontological relation; thus, all are bound up in Christ's humanity, regardless of their attitude toward the incarnate Son of God:

Now since in Jesus Christ the Creator Word has become man in such a way that in him Divine Nature and human nature are indivisibly united in his own Person, the humanity of every man, whether he knows it or not, whether he believes or not, is ontologically bound up with the humanity of Jesus, and determined by it. Jesus himself, then, is the true secret of the nature of every human being.³²⁴

Thus, by grounding union with Christ on the creational solidarity of Christ with humankind, Torrance makes carnal union not only unique but also universal in scope.³²⁵

³²²Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 72.

³²³Torrance, School of Faith, cxiii. See also "Interim Report of the Special Commission on Baptism," Minutes of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland (May 1958), 726.

³²⁴Torrance, "The Goodness and Dignity of Man in the Christian Tradition," 317. See also Torrance, School of Faith, cxi-cxii.

³²⁵Interestingly, from this vantage, it is possible to see the title Torrance gave his main New College lecture on anhypostasia as something of a play on words. The "once and for all union" applies universally to all men, and not just chronologically to

Thus, it becomes easier to see why Torrance calls this anhypostatic solidarity, if in isolation from enhypostasia, "only ontological and therefore physical and mechanical - a causal and necessitarian solidarity."³²⁶ It is not just that the Logos is the creator and that this ontologically significant Logos has incarnated. Rather, in doing so he has taken the humanity of all to himself; thus, his humanity constitutes the ontological ground of every human's being.

In addition, in light of this further clarification of anhypostatic solidarity, we can better appreciate the place Torrance gives enhypostasia in his thinking. We have seen that his development of carnal union is not merely anhypostatic, but includes a role for the Holy Spirit as actualizing agent.³²⁷ Thus, even within the context of anhypostatic solidarity, Torrance asserts the need for an enhypostatic relation--a personal interaction with Christ, based on the correlative communion of the Spirit--lest the place of individual human response be overwhelmed.³²⁸

But what role does his stressing the universal extent of the incarnation play in his wider theology? Torrance utilizes this creationally grounded concept of Christ's

all time (Torrance, "The Once and for All Union of God and Man in Christ--His Birth into our Humanity"). This is in clear contrast with the title of his first New College lecture on enhypostasia (Torrance, "The Continuous Union in the Historical Life and Obedience of Jesus").

³²⁶Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 9.

³²⁷Torrance, School of Faith, cvi.

³²⁸Thus, Torrance describes the life of Christ as the "personalizing of others in their contact with him," bestowing the title "Personalizing Person" upon the incarnate Word (T. F. Torrance, "The Soul and Person, in Theological Perspective," in Religion, Reason and The Self: Essays in Honour of Hywel D. Lewis, ed. Stewart R. Sutherland and T. A. Roberts [Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1989], 115-116).

anhypostatic solidarity with all humankind when addressing the extent of the Holy

Spirit's ministry:

How wide is the range of "the carnal union" which Christ has effected between Himself as the Incarnate Son and human flesh? Does this include all men, or does it refer only to the elect? This is of fundamental importance for the doctrine of the Spirit. If Christ's incarnational union with us involves all men, then we must give a proper interpretation to the pouring out of the Spirit upon "all flesh", but if Christ's incarnational union only involves those who believe in Him or only some out of the human race, then the doctrine of the Spirit's work must be changed accordingly.³²⁹

What theological options stand before us, in Torrance's mind?

The question to be faced then is whether Christ only entered into a generic relation with men through becoming one particular man, or also entered into an ontological relation with all men in the assumption of our human flesh.³³⁰

As our study of his developing christology has shown, Torrance clearly prefers the latter of these two alternatives. But what particularly moves him to reject the first option?

Two caveats against the former ought to be stated right away. If Christ only entered into a generic relation with men then (a) the saving union of men with Christ must be regarded as an additional union added by the Spirit on to the union which He has perfected in Himself; and (b) the Church can only be construed in terms of an extension of the Incarnation, both of which we must reject as erroneous.³³¹

³²⁹Torrance, School of Faith, cxi. Torrance here is alluding to Joel 2:28, which he had first brought up in his introduction (Torrance, School of Faith, cii). On this basis, Torrance will clarify the relationship between carnal union with Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit: "The 'carnal union' effected by Christ between Himself and all men supplies, as it were, the field of the Spirit's activity, so that in a profound sense we have to take seriously the fact that the Spirit was poured out on 'all flesh' and operates on 'all flesh'" (Torrance, School of Faith, cxvii).

³³⁰Torrance, School of Faith, cxii-cxiii.

³³¹Torrance, School of Faith, cxii. Guthridge notes that Torrance is here in polemic against Roman Catholic doctrine (Guthridge, 411-417).

Torrance is not blind to the line of theological argument that might be put forward for the alternative view, but he deems it mistaken:

It may be argued that this applies only to the eternal Son, but if we really hold that the human nature and the divine nature share in one hypostasis or person, it will be extremely difficult to maintain that Christ has only generic relation to men. In any case it belongs to the very essence of the Incarnational life and work of the Son that in Him redemption penetrates back to the very beginning and reunites man's life to God's creative purpose. Redemption is no mere afterthought on the part of God, for in it the original creation comes to a transcendent realisation, and the one Covenant of Grace made with all creation is fulfilled.³³²

However, this issue is of such importance that Torrance digresses even further to counter this other line of thought with more biblical evidence:

The Biblical teaching is quite explicit that in Christ all things are really involved in reconciliation, that He is not only the Head of believers but the Head of all creation and that all things visible and invisible are gathered up and cohere in Him--from which we cannot exclude a relation in being between all men and Christ. The teaching of the earlier of these Catechisms is that Christ is the Head of men and angels, the Head of all men, and as the Head of all men died for all men, so that all men are involved already objectively in His human life and in His work in life and death, i.e. not only on judicial and transactional grounds, but on the ground of the constitution of His Person as Mediator.³³³

The other important role that the universal extent of the incarnation plays in Torrance's wider theology is with regard to the extent of the atonement. In his New College lecture "The Range of Redemption," Torrance tackles this issue head on:

What is the relation of the Incarnation to the Atonement? If these cannot be separated, then Christ represents in His death all whom He represents in His Incarnation. If they can be separated, then even if He represents all men in His Incarnation, He can represent in His death only those for whom He chooses to bear judgment, or only those whom the Father gives Him according to His

³³²Torrance, School of Faith, cxii-cxiii.

³³³Torrance, School of Faith, cxiii.

What answer does Torrance give?

Atonement and Incarnation cannot be separated from one another, and therefore the range of redemption is the same in both. In both all men are involved. In the Incarnation Christ, the eternal Son, took upon Him the nature of man, and all who belong to human nature are involved and are represented--ALL men without exception, so that for all and each, Jesus Christ stood in as substitute and advocate in His life and in His death. Because He is the eternal Logos in whom all men cohere, for Him to take human nature upon Himself means that all men are assumed by His Incarnation, and all men are bound up with Him. He died for all men and all men died in Him.³³⁵

This conviction is obviously strong in Torrance's mind, as he even puts his position with greater theological strength:

By his incarnate constitution as the Mediator between God and man who is at once Creator God and creaturely man, Jesus Christ as Man represents all mankind: in him all men have the creative and sustaining source of their being. He cannot but represent in his death all whom he represents in his incarnate constitution. Atonement and incarnation cannot be separated from one another, and therefore the range of his redemption is the same in both.³³⁶

In two sentences of typical Torrancian complexity, he traces implications of rejecting this universal person and work of Christ:

That then is the first thing we have to say, that Christ died for all men, and no man can undo or escape the fact that he is died for, and no man can evade, elude or avoid the face [sic] that he is loved by God--therefore when he does the inconceivable thing in the face of that love, namely, refuse it, defy it, turn away from it, that unavoidable self-giving of God is his judgment--it opposes his refusal of God, it opposes his attempt to elude God, and is therefore his

³³⁴Torrance, "The Range of Redemption." Unpublished New College Lecture, 5.

³³⁵Torrance, "The Range of Redemption," 5. Torrance then goes on to discuss this issue historically, combatting "hyper-Calvinists" and "Scholastic Calvinists," such as Wollebius, Samuel Rutherford, John Brown of Wamphray, and John Owen (Torrance, "The Range of Redemption," 5-8).

³³⁶Torrance, "The Atonement: The Singularity of Christ and the Finality of the Cross: The Atonement and the Moral Order," 244-245.

judgment in the very event of refusal. If we think of the Incarnation of Christ into our human nature, and therefore in view of the fact that all men have been ingrafted into Christ, in that He has made Himself a brother of them all in their flesh and existence, then we may think of man's refusal of the atonement, a refusal met by God's opposition of love, as a breaking of him off like a branch from the vine, and yet that must not be thought of as if it meant the undoing of the fact that Christ died for him.³³⁷

Thus, Torrance, who is opposed to any such limitation of the extent of the atonement, has found in his doctrine of carnal union with Christ a more profound level on which to address this historic problem in Scottish theology: Christ's anhypostatic solidarity with humankind makes the doctrine of limited atonement an ontological impossibility.³³⁸

Christ's humanity is, then, more than human nature generally conceived.³³⁹ It is not generic humanity in some Platonic sense.³⁴⁰ And it is not humanity that is neutral

³³⁷Torrance, "The Range of Redemption," 8. Kruger notes that Torrance's description of hell is subtly formulated to exclude wrath and anger in God (Kruger, 319-321).

³³⁸For Torrance's opposition to the doctrine of limited atonement, especially as found in "many of the theologians of the Disruption and . . . still maintained in all its rationalistic and rigid intransigence in the Western Isles," see Torrance, "The Place of the Humanity of Christ in the Sacramental Life of the Church," 7-9. Kruger insightfully notes: "Underneath all of Torrance's theology stands the hidden heartbeat of his opposition to the limiting factor in traditional Calvinism" (Kruger, 333). Kruger attributes this fact to Torrance's missionary upbringing.

³³⁹"But because the human nature assumed in the Incarnation is more than human nature in general, because in the Incarnation Jesus the individual Man is the human nature in with the eternal Son, more must be said" (Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 8).

³⁴⁰Torrance demurs from generic conceptions of Christ's humanity (Torrance, School of Faith, cxii). Apparently, Torrance is rebutting Hendry, who says of the Eastern fathers: "This humanity, as we have seen, was conceived not merely as individual, but as generic or universal; its assumption by the eternal Son at the incarnation was understood to mean, not merely that he became a man, like other men, but that in some sense he became *man*; he entered into some kind of ontological relation with humanity as a whole. It is now generally held that this doctrine rests upon a tenet of the Platonic philosophy that has been generally rejected by modern

and, therefore, merely instrumental to his person.³⁴¹ Torrance rejects such mere instrumentalism, so as to avoid a merely external, forensic model of the atonement.³⁴²

thought, viz., that the ideas of things have a real existence that is prior to, and even superior to, the existence of the things themselves" (Hendry, 59). Torrance distanced himself from such platonic idealism early in life: "It is important to note here that the Incarnation does not mean that the Word united Himself to humanity as a whole in some metaphysical fashion" (Torrance, "The Place and Function of Reason in Christian Theology," 40). Torrance can come to a conclusion similar to the one Hendry describes, but not on Platonic grounds.

³⁴¹"For many people, the difficulty with Chalcedonian Christology is this, that when it speaks of 'the human nature' of Christ, it seems to be speaking of some neutral human nature, of which we know in some way from our general knowledge of humanity, even though we have nowhere any actual experience of such human nature" (Torrance, "The Patristic Doctrine of Christ," 3). "If Christ assumed neutral or perfect human nature, and assumed it into oneness with His own divine Person, who could not choose to sin any more than He could choose not to be God, then the humanity of Christ is merely instrumental in the hands of God" (Torrance, "The Patristic Doctrine of Christ," 9). "The soteriological principle involved here was formulated by the early Church in various ways: 'the unassumed is the unhealed', 'what Christ has not taken upon himself has not been saved'. The crucial question was whether Christ took upon himself our fallen humanity with its alienated mind, and thereby laid hold of the root of our sin lodged in it, in order to redeem, heal and sanctify it in himself within his own holy life and activity as the incarnate Mediator, or whether he acted redeemingly upon our fallen existence through some kind of external activity, as if he were merely an instrument or intermediary in the hands of God effecting our salvation. Thus the issue at stake was whether in his incarnation Christ took some neutral humanity upon himself, or whether he actually became what we are in order to make us what he is" (Torrance, "The Atonement: The Singularity of Christ and the Finality of the Cross: The Atonement and the Moral Order," 237-238). As seen previously, Torrance's development of the communicatio idiomatum specifically rejected the Protestant Scholastics' emphasis upon an instrumental divine economy for Christ's humanity and the forensic model. Compare Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 7; Heppe, 439.

³⁴²Torrance, "Incarnation and Atonement: Theosis and Henosis in the Light of Modern Scientific Rejection of Dualism," 5: ". . . if the incarnation is not thought of in terms of the saving and healing assumption of our fallen human nature and is therefore not internally integrated with the atonement, then the doctrine of atonement can be formulated only in terms of an external transaction of a merely judicial and legalist kind. . . ." "Jesus Christ is not just an instrument in the hands of God arbitrarily to be taken up, used, and laid aside at will; he *is* God become man, and remains God even though he has come among us as man" (Torrance, The Christian Doctrine of God,

Rather, Christ's unique and universal humanity is integral and essential to the divine Word's incarnate constitution and work.

One final word should be said about the universal range of Christ's headship and resulting carnal union. This incarnate headship extends not just to all human beings, as might be expected with a more Platonic view, but includes more:

Anhypostasia, as the sheer act of divine grace, means the assumption of all human nature by the Creator Word of God, and implies that the Incarnation has a cosmic range which takes in not only all men but all creation: He who became incarnate in Jesus Christ is the Head of all things, by whom all things visible and invisible are made. Anhypostasia refers therefore to a transcendent act of God, universal in its range, which is fulfilled by God himself and does not have to be forged or established by us.³⁴³

Thus, the anhypostatic assumption involves not just all men but all creation. In the hypostatic union, the person of the Word makes the whole Christ the ontological ground of all creation:

. . . Christ came to undertake a cosmic mission, to gather up all things and to be the Head of all things³⁴⁴

In other words, Torrance's concept of anhypostatic solidarity is profoundly creational: it does not involve just humans because Christ has assumed human nature, but it

216). Torrance has long rejected an external understanding of Christ's humanity. See Torrance, "The Place and Function of Reason in Christian Theology," 32.

³⁴³Torrance, "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," 3.

³⁴⁴Torrance, School of Faith, cii. Thus, Christ's mission is both universal and unique. The uniqueness of Christ's cosmic mission is the point where Torrance's christology informs his work on science and theology at its most basic level, described more fully under the theme of singularity. On the singularity of the Logos and light, see Torrance, Christian Theology and Scientific Culture.

involves the whole cosmos because the Word of God made it.³⁴⁵ Torrance repeatedly styles this wider level of Christ's anhypostatic solidarity "cosmic" and "of cosmic significance," originally drawing the title from H. A. A. Kennedy's Theology of the Epistles.³⁴⁶

This theme of the unique and universal nature of Christ's anhypostatic solidarity with us is not new to our study. We have seen the genetic roots of it long before Torrance's introduction to The School of Faith or his New College lectures. But they provide us with the clue of where to look in Torrance's earlier corpus for conceptual progenitors.

³⁴⁵Torrance allows his christology to inform his doctrine of creation: "The fact that he who freely created the universe has once for all become incarnate within it, means that the Creator God wills freely to coexist with his creaturely children, and therefore that the continuing existence of the universe is ontologically bound to the crucified and risen Jesus and destined to partake in the consummation of God's eternal purpose in him" (Torrance, Christian Doctrine of God, 217). Drawing from Colossians 1:16, Torrance calls this relation "an unbreakable bond" (Torrance, Christian Doctrine of God, 244). Torrance is again following his old professor, H. R. Mackintosh, who insisted: "The aorist tense is used to affirm that Christ created all things, for the writer is thinking of the pre-existent One; but the fact that he lapses into perfects and presents is a suggestive hint that he contemplates this pre-existence through the medium, so to speak, of the exalted Life. . . . His function as Creator is proleptically conditioned by His achievement as Saviour" (Mackintosh, 70). For Torrance's explicit use of Mackintosh's exegesis, see Torrance, School of Faith, ciii; and Torrance, Christian Doctrine of God, 109, 204.

³⁴⁶The first occasion of this title, Christ's "cosmic significance," is early in his Auburn christology lectures, where Torrance is quoting Kennedy (Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 98-99). Here Torrance draws the terminology several times from Kennedy's Theology of the Epistles, which includes the section, "The Cosmic Relations of Christ" (Kennedy, 152-160). This work was influential early in Torrance's life, just before he prepared these lectures (Hesselink, 53). For examples of Torrance's repeated use of this theme, see Torrance, "The Mystery of Christ," 6; Torrance, "Atoning Justification," 17; Torrance, "Range of Redemption," 9-12; Torrance, Theology in Reconstruction, 217; Torrance, Space, Time and Resurrection, 21-22, 25-26, 103, 154. For this general theme, see also Torrance, Christian Doctrine of God, 217, 237, 244.

In his New College lecture "Atoning Justification," Torrance revisits this theme of anhypostatic solidarity in no uncertain terms. However, linked to it are some familiar words:

Paul speaks of this question of the One and the Many by contrasting Christ and Adam - not that they are set side by side as parallel figures. The significance of the comparison we can see if we remember that Adam as man was made in the image of God. Man was created by the Word of God, and it is in and from that Word that he has his true being and his true manhood. We have fallen from that estate, but the true secret of humanity is lodged in the Word. In the incarnation of this Word, Christ became the proper man, as Luther calls Him, the true Man, and because that Word made flesh is the creative source and true secret of our humanity, because in Him our humanity is lodged, because all men consist in Him, He is the only one who can really represent all men from the innermost centre and depth of human being. He came then, not only as the Creator of our race, but as the Head of our race, for in Him the whole race consists.³⁴⁷

In this passage there can be little doubt that Torrance is exploring anhypostatic solidarity: "the creative source and true secret of our humanity." The parallels with Torrance's earlier Auburn Seminary lecture titled "The Mediation of Christ" some two decades before are striking.³⁴⁸

We have already seen that this earlier passage in the Auburn lectures aptly reiterated a set of themes drawn in one way or another from F. D. Maurice, R. W. Dale, Thomas Carlyle, Martin Luther, John McLeod Campbell, H. R. Mackintosh,

³⁴⁷Torrance, "Atoning Justification," 14. On the "proper Man" theme, see Torrance, School of Faith, cxxii.

³⁴⁸Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 280. Although the passages are not exactly the same word-for-word, the conceptual and verbal parallels are multiple: "the proper Man as Luther called Him," "the Head of our race," "the only one who can actually represent all men," and "for all men consist in Him." Note, our claim here is not necessarily that Torrance copied from one passage to another, but that these sections are conceptually parallel, helping us to trace the genetic roots of Torrance's developing thought.

Emil Brunner, and perhaps H. A. A. Kennedy. At the very least, this passage travels in a universe of ideas that is strongly British (even Scottish) and quite fascinating, since it represents a line of thought that has become central to Torrance's theology even at this early stage. Previously attached to one side of Torrance's early, double-stranded christological construction, in his more mature theology, this theme of Christ's solidarity stands more on its own under the rubric of anhypostasia, while the two earlier strands so indebted to Campbell now fall under the rubric of enhypostasia.

Conclusion

The development of T. F. Torrance's doctrine of union with Christ has now been traced and its uniquely Scottish roots highlighted. Torrance teaches one union with Christ, wrought out in the hypostatic union, when the Logos assumed, sanctified, and healed our fallen humanity in the incarnation. This carnal union with Christ was once for all, producing an anhypostatic solidarity of a unique nature and universal extent between Christ's humanity and ours, based on the ontological bond between the Logos and humankind, as well as all creation. This doctrine of union with Christ produces no dogmatic division between carnal and spiritual union.

CHAPTER 2

ATHANASIUS ON UNION WITH CHRIST

For men's mind having finally fallen to things of sense, the Word disguised Himself by appearing in a body, that He might, as Man, transfer men to Himself, and centre their senses on Himself, and, men seeing Him thenceforth as Man, persuade them by the works He did that He is not Man only, but also God, and the Word and Wisdom of the true God. Athanasius, De Incarnatione, 16.1.

... He takes to Himself a body capable of death, that it, by partaking of the Word Who is above all, might be worthy to die in the stead of all, and might, because of the Word which was come to dwell in it, remain incorruptible, and that thenceforth corruption might be stayed from all by the Grace of the Resurrection. Athanasius, De Incarnatione, 9.1.

Who was Athanasius?¹ In recent patristics studies this is clearly a vexing question. A wide range of differing Athanasian interpretations are readily obvious in the field, and no clear consensus of opinion has yet emerged, especially on the nature and status of Christ's humanity in Athanasius' written corpus. However, amidst the tangle of conflicting patrological opinion, at least three different interpretive approaches to or estimations of Athanasius' christology may be seen. These three broad bands of Athanasian interpretation are not so much common schools of thought as they are groupings of opinion based on common concerns.

¹Athanasius (c. 295-373) was, of course, a crucial figure in the development of christological orthodoxy. For a list of authentic Athanasian works and their dates, see R. P. C. Hanson, The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988), 417-421. For background and recent bibliography on Athanasius' life and theology, see Michael O'Carroll, Trinitas (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1987), 31-38; and Everett Ferguson, ed., Encyclopedia of Early Christianity (New York: Garland Publishing, 1990), 110-112. Charles Kannengiesser notes the abiding influence of Athanasius on three levels: his conception of man, interpreting Scripture, and systematizing doctrines on the incarnation (Charles Kannengiesser, "Athanasius and Traditional Christology," Theological Studies 34 [1973]: 106-107).

The first of these general approaches is, perhaps, currently the majority report among patristics scholars. Ubiquitous from the time of F. C. Baur, and carrying through the analyses of K. Hoss, A. Stülcken, and M. Richard, right up to the more recent studies of C. Kannengiesser, R. P. C. Hanson, and A. Grillmeier, this view asserts that Athanasius has a deficient view of the humanity of Christ in union with the Word. Specifically, this approach sees in Athanasius no place for the soul of Christ in his exposition of either the person of Christ or the plan of salvation.²

C. Twombly adequately summarizes this outlook:

It is argued that a human soul in Christ is missing altogether or that it is present but has no active function. In either case, Athanasius would seem to represent an incipient Apollinarianism in which the divine Logos, for all practical purposes, takes over the functions of a human mind.³

Hanson labels this position "space-suit Christology."⁴ As Grillmeier puts it: ". . . in the Athanasian picture of Christ the 'soul' of the Lord is no 'theological factor.'"⁵ This appears to be the decisive issue in this approach to Christ in Athanasius.

A second approach also finds widespread support in the community of patristic scholars and is reflected in J. N. D. Kelly's somewhat more tentative conclusions.

Kelly covers much of the same ground dealt with by the previous group of interpreters.

²For a review of the literature in the history of interpretation on this point, see Johannes Quasten, Patrology (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960), 3:72-76; and Aloys Grillmeier, Christ in the Christian Tradition, vol. 1, trans. John Bowden (London: Mowbrays, 1975), 309-310.

³Charles G. Twombly, "The Nature of Christ's Humanity: A Study in Athanasius," Patristic and Byzantine Review 8 (1989): 227.

⁴Hanson, 448.

⁵Grillmeier, Christ in the Christian Tradition, 1:308. Torrance explicitly attacks this interpretation in Torrance, Theology in Reconciliation, 228-229.

He accepts the classic distinction between christological schools: Alexandrian and Antiochene, or Word-flesh and Word-man, respectively.⁶ Kelly views Arian christology as the "extreme left wing" of Alexandrian christology, whereas Athanasius is the "classic representative" of the Alexandrian approach.⁷ He states:

... the Word for Athanasius was the governing principle, or ἡγεμονικόν, in Jesus Christ, the subject of all the sayings, experiences and actions attributed to the Gospel figure.⁸

Clearly, this raises questions about the communicatio idiomatum, the passibility of the Word, and the place of a human rational soul in Athanasius' theology. Kelly notes that Athanasius deals with experiences which "might be thought hard to reconcile with [the Word's] deity and impassibility" by positing a distinction between "the Word in His eternal being" and the Word incarnate--indicating "that it is to His fleshly nature that we should attribute these human weaknesses and sufferings." Furthermore, says Kelly, Athanasius "as far as possible . . . gives a purely physical explanation of his distress, fear, etc.; these traits were παθήματα τῆς σαρκός."⁹ Kelly argues that Athanasius' "anthropology . . . was thoroughly Platonic and treated the soul as having no necessary connexion with the body" and that this, in light of "his regular description of Christ's human nature as 'flesh' or 'body,'" tends to confirm the hypothesis that Athanasius had a proto-Apollinarian view of Christ's humanity.¹⁰

⁶J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines (London: A. & C. Black, 1977, 5th ed.), 284-285.

⁷Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, 285.

⁸Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, 285-286.

⁹Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, 286.

¹⁰Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, 287.

Three main arguments are commonly given to defend the idea that Athanasius actually did envision a human rational soul in Christ. First, the linguistic argument asserts that "flesh" meant "man" in Athanasius' writings. Second, the implicit argument asserts that Athanasius never overtly denied the soul of Christ and tacitly assumed it. Third, the developmental argument asserts that Athanasius changed his view after the synod of Alexandria in 362 A.D. Kelly considers all three and finds them wanting.¹¹

Nevertheless, Kelly is typically cautious and nuanced in his conclusions. His verdict seems to be "not proven," while at the same time he leans toward Grillmeier's position and has clearly demonstrated that Athanasius cannot be quoted in support of an anti-Apollinarian usage of the non-assumptus.¹²

The third approach is that of T. F. Torrance, C. Twombly, G. Dragas, and T. Hart. These scholars argue that the genius of Athanasius' christology, in which Christ in his mediatorial priesthood

takes unto himself the full character of our humanity so that he can offer what is ours to God, not only requires a human soul but, in some sense, an active one as well.¹³

Torrance expresses it eloquently:

Before we go on to discuss these questions further, however, we must consider another fact pointed out by Athanasius, that when the Lord for our sake became man it was impossible that the body he possessed should lack either

¹¹Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, 286-289.

¹²Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, 288-289.

¹³C. Twombly, "The Nature of Christ's Humanity," 227. See also Torrance, Theology in Reconciliation, 215-226; T. Hart, "Two Models of Salvation in Relation to Christological Understanding in the Patristic East," (Ph.D. diss., Aberdeen University, 1989), especially chapters 4 and 5; G. Dragas, Athanasiana (London, 1980), 7-34.

soul or mind, for salvation pertains to the whole man, and it would be a myth if it extended to the body only. That is the very point variously expressed by Gregory of Nazianzus and Cyril of Alexandria: "the unassumed is the unhealed," what has not been taken up has not been saved.¹⁴

Indeed, according to Torrance, Athanasius does more than "point out" this principle.

It is a major emphasis of Contra Arianos and of his whole theology. Torrance explains that Athanasius

understood the humanity of Jesus Christ as the humanity of him whom is not only Apostle from God but High Priest taken from among men, and the saving work of Christ in terms of his *human* as well as divine agency--it is the human priesthood and the saving mediatorship of Jesus Christ in and through his human kinship with us that Athanasius found so significant. That is certainly one of the major emphases of Athanasius in the *Contra Arianos*, as well as in other writings where he expounds the doctrine of the saving humanity of Christ in terms of the obedient life and the self-sanctification on our behalf, and yet it is so often completely omitted by Patristic scholars, as in the work of A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*.¹⁵

As bold and exhilarating as this interpretation may be, it has not found widespread support from patristic scholars, being clearly incompatible with either of the two previous approaches.

The reserve of mainstream patrology about this third approach is understandable. Hart has made a recent attempt to elaborate and substantiate Torrance's view that there are, in fact, not one but two Alexandrian christological traditions: one which is influenced by Platonism and hence proto-Apollinarian or latent-Apollinarian, and the other which is explicitly anti-Apollinarian and proto-Cappadocian. On this view, Athanasius clearly falls into the latter camp. While the thesis is provocative, the exegetical arguments are inconclusive, especially in light of

¹⁴Torrance, Theology in Reconciliation, 112.

¹⁵Torrance, Theology in Reconciliation, 228-229.

Lyman's more recent treatment.¹⁶ Torrance's own arguments, heavily dependent as they are on Contra Arianos III and IV, do not reckon with new questions about the authorship of Contra Arianos III.¹⁷ Nor does Torrance pay much attention to ongoing patristic discussion.¹⁸ Dragas' brilliant linguistic approach to the theological problem, too, fails to come to grips with Kelly's incisive arguments.¹⁹

In addition to these three approaches of widely differing Athanasian interpretation, which have such conflicting views of Athanasius' person, corpus, and basic christology, another equally pressing problem confronts us. Athanasius has no unified treatment of the locus of "union with Christ" as it is conceived in modern dogmatics, whereas both Calvin and Barth do. Hence, Athanasius' views must be

¹⁶R. J. Lyman, Christology and Cosmology, Models of Divine Activity in Origen, Eusebius and Athanasius (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 141-159.

¹⁷C. Kannengiesser, "Athanasius' So-Called Third Oration Against the Arians," unpublished manuscript; and C. Kannengiesser, "Athanasius of Alexandria *Three Orations Against the Arians*: A Reappraisal," Studia Patristica 17 (1982), 981-995.

¹⁸For instance, Torrance asserts in his Trinitarian Faith that for Athanasius Christ's work would have been meaningless were his humanity in any way deficient. But, at the same time, Torrance utterly ignores reference to current patristic discussion, and nowhere in his treatment of Athanasius in that volume does he alert the student that there is any other opinion of Athanasius' teaching on Christ's humanity other than his own. Torrance, Trinitarian Faith, 152.

¹⁹Kelly observes: "Even if the linguistic argument, however, is inconclusive, the fact must be faced that [Athanasius'] thought simply allowed no room for a human mind [in Christ]." Kelly goes on to say that "[Athanasius'] attitude was revealed in a very striking way when he came to deal with the Arians' contention that the Saviour's ignorance, sufferings, etc., should properly be attributed to the Word, Who on their hypothesis was a creature. Had Athanasius admitted a human soul, here surely was a golden opportunity for him to point to it, rather than the divine, impassible Word, as the true subject of these experiences. But this obvious solution, as we have seen, never apparently occurred to him; instead he strained every nerve to attribute them to the flesh" (Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, 287).

collected and integrated by implication. So when we speak of "Athanasius' doctrine of union with Christ," we are not implying that he had anything like the developed Reformation or post-Reformation construct of that locus. We are more simply referring to themes or aspects of his christology that clearly relate to union with Christ.

Most important of all, we must not lose sight of the goal of this chapter in the context of our present study--to examine the doctrine of union with Christ as it might be found in Athanasius, with a view to a more full appreciation of that same doctrine in the theology of T. F. Torrance. For all these reasons, we are faced with a unique task. Therefore, in this second chapter, we will survey a number of key themes in the Athanasian corpus that are related to the later, more developed doctrine of union with Christ. These themes will be selected in light of their potential relevance to Torrance's own theology.²⁰

Selected Athanasian Themes

The following seven Athanasian themes were selected for examination: the Father-Son relation, the Logos and creation, Christ's body, Christ's soul, Christ's human solidarity, Christ's death, and Christ's universal relevance.

²⁰Within Torrance's rich and varied corpus, two sets of published materials interact in a more profound and sustained manner with Athanasian themes related to incarnational union with Christ than any others: Torrance, "Athanasius: A Study in the Foundations of Classical Theology," ch. 5 in Theology in Reconciliation, 215-266; and Torrance, "The Incarnate Saviour," ch. 5 in Trinitarian Faith, 146-190. The first of these has recently been reprinted as Torrance, "Athanasius: A Study in the Foundations of Classical Theology," ch. 7 in Divine Meaning, 179-228. From these two sources, the following Athanasian themes were selected for closer examination, based on our topic of interest: the Father-Son relation, the Logos and creation, Christ's body, Christ's soul, Christ's human solidarity, Christ's death, and Christ's universal relevance. However, for our limited purposes here, sustained interaction or engagement with Torrance's reading of Athanasius will not be allowed to dominate this chapter.

The Father-Son Relation

Athanasius teaches that the Son partakes of the essence of the Father, as he is the offspring of the Father's essence. Christians, then, partake of God by partaking of the Son.²¹ He holds the Johannine teaching that the Son and the Father are one, explaining this unity by teaching that the Logos is from the same essence with the Father. The Logos was ever existent. Therefore, His union with the Father is not a mere joining or attaching, but a coexistence with the Father.²² Athanasius affirms that "God the Word Himself is Christ from Mary, God and Man."²³

C. J. De Vogel aptly summarizes Athanasius on the Son's participation:

There is a certain misunderstanding about Athanasius' use of the notion of participation. Some theologians are wont to say that the term is essential to Athanasius' theology. That statement, however, is a bit confusing. For it suggests that this Greek Father expressed his doctrine of the Trinity by preference in terms of participation. And that is not the case. For him, participation was the correct term to express the relation from God to man, and this was Platonic, indeed. For in Plato "participation" is no partnership of equal rights and at the same level. Therefore, it is in principle not the right term to signify the relation of the Father and the Son. And for that reason Athanasius says: "The Son does not partake of anything." If, none the less, he speaks of

²¹St. Athanasius: Select Works and Letters, ed. Archibald Robertson, in A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, second series, Vol. IV, Philip Schaff and Henry Wace gen. eds. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978. Orationes Contra Arianos I.5.16: ". . . what is from the essence of the Father, and proper to Him, is entirely of the Son; for it is all one to say that God is wholly participated, and that He begets; and what does begetting signify but a son? And thus the Son Himself, all things partake according to the grace of the Spirit coming from Him; and this shews that the Son Himself partakes of nothing, but what is partaken from the Father, is the Son; for, as partaking of the Son Himself, we are said to partake of God; and this is what Peter said, that 'ye may be partakers in a divine nature.'" Henceforth, this will be abbreviated CA. See also Athanasius, Ad Adelphium 4.

²²CA IV.5.

²³CA IV.35.

"total participation," he is well aware of the fact that this is rather a self-contradictory notion, anyway quite an unplatonic usage of the term, as Heinrich Dorrie would not have failed to remark. However, by himself Athanasius did not speak of "taking part" to express the relation of the Son to the Father, but he always uses the images found in Scripture: those of the fountain, of radiation, and of "perfect image" or "stamp."²⁴

The Logos and Creation

The fact that the Logos took a human body, in the teaching of Athanasius, neither limits him in power nor makes him bound by his body. The Logos rather maintained his power and work of providence by governing the world which was created through him and by him. Therefore Athanasius can say:

Thus even while present in a human body and Himself quickening it, He was, without inconsistency, quickening the universe as well, and was in every process of nature, and was outside the whole, and while known from the body by His works, He was none the less manifest from the working of the universe as well.²⁵

Athanasius makes the doctrine of creation ex nihilo and the creation of mankind the cornerstone of his doctrine of incarnation. He affirms that God "has made all things out of nothing by his own Word, Jesus Christ our Lord."²⁶ His appeal to creation of the world ex nihilo shows that the same God who created all things has also wrought the salvation of creation in the Word by whom he made it.²⁷ His appeal to the

²⁴C. J. De Vogel, "Platonism and Christianity: A Mere Antagonism or a Profound Common Ground," Vigiliae Christianae 39 (1985): 51.

²⁵Athanasius, De Incarnatione Verbi Dei 17.2. Henceforth, this will be abbreviated as DI.

²⁶DI 3.2.

²⁷DI 1.2. Also: "But if for now the Christ is entered into heaven itself, though He was always Lord and framer of the heavens, for us therefore is that present exaltation written" (CA I.11.41.). See also CA I.12.46.

creation of man demonstrates that the reason for Jesus' incarnation was the lovingkindness of the Word.²⁸ Thus, Athanasius says:

For of His becoming incarnate we were the object, and for our salvation He dealt so lovingly as to appear and be born even in a human body.²⁹

Athanasius seems to indicate that the incarnation was inescapable. On the one hand, once corruption came and abode in the human race, "the rational man made in God's image was disappearing; and the handiwork of God was in process of dissolution."³⁰ So, God could not have allowed that "creatures once made rational, and having partaken of the Word should go to ruin, and turn again to non-existence by the way of corruption."³¹

Therefore, in his goodness, God had to provide a way out of this situation without violating his own law, lest he become a monstrous and weak God.³² However, as the just claims of God have to remain upon all, therefore, Christ or the Word of the Father was the only one able to "recreate everything, and worthy to suffer on behalf of all and to be ambassador for all with the Father."³³

Christ's Body

Athanasius conceives of the incarnation as the incorporeal, immaterial, and

²⁸DI 4,5.2.

²⁹DI 4,5.3.

³⁰DI 6.1.

³¹DI 6.4.

³²DI 6.8,9.

³³DI 7.5.

incorruptible Word of God coming down to our realm. According to Athanasius, the Word is never far from us, for the Word "has filled all things everywhere, remaining present with His own Father."³⁴

Athanasius emphasizes the purity of Mary in order to attach a special distinctness to Christ's humanity. But at the same time, Athanasius retains a link between the role of the Word in creation and his incarnate body. As the mighty creator, the Logos prepared his own body in Mary's womb, making it his temple in which to dwell. Thus he says:

For being Himself Mighty, and Artificer of everything, He prepares the body in the Virgin as a temple unto Himself, and makes it His very own as an instrument, in it manifested, and in it dwelling.³⁵

According to Athanasius, the Savior has not worn a body as a consequence of his own nature, because he is incorporeal by nature and is the Word from the beginning. Instead, the Savior has worn a body because of the Father's lovingkindness and goodness, and this for the purpose of our salvation.³⁶

Athanasius clearly maintains the individuality of Christ's body:

³⁴DI 8.1.

³⁵DI 8.3. Athanasius also clearly states of Christ's true humanity: "That then which was born from Mary was according to the divine Scriptures human by nature, and the body of the Lord was a true one; but it was this, because it was the same as our body, for Mary was our sister inasmuch as we all are from Adam" (Athanasius, Ad Epictetum 7). See also Athanasius, Ad Epictetum 8-9.

³⁶DI 1.2. Athanasius was also clearly not tolerant of adoptionism: "But with regard to the imagination of some, who say that the Word came upon one particular man, the Son of Mary, just as it came upon each of the Prophets, it is superfluous to discuss, since their madness carries its own condemnation manifestly with it. For if He came thus, why was that man born of a virgin, and not like others of a man and a woman?" (Athanasius, Ad Epictetum, 11).

But He takes a body of our kind, and not merely so, but from a spotless and stainless virgin, knowing not a man, a body clean and very truth pure from intercourse of men.³⁷

He affirms that Christ's body was of "no different sort from ours."³⁸ He states that Christ's body was not subjected to every weakness of the human body. For example, Christ's body could have never died of sickness or hunger:

Why did He not prevent death as He did sickness? Because it was for this that He had the body, and it was unfitting to prevent it, lest the resurrection also should be hindered He hungered, agreeable to the properties of His body, but He did not perish of hunger, because of the Lord that wore it.³⁹

Christ's Soul

In De Incarnatione does Athanasius imply that Christ did not have a soul? He states:

Now, it is the function of the soul to behold even what is outside its own body, by acts of thought, without, however, working outside its own body, or moving by its presence things remote from its body. Never, that is, does a man by thinking of things at a distance, by that fact either remove or displace them; nor if a man were to sit in his own house and reason about the heavenly bodies, would he by that fact either move the sun or make the heavens revolve. But he sees that they move and have their being, without being actually able to influence them. Now, the Word of God in His man's nature was not like that; for He was not bound to His body, but rather Himself wielding it, so that He was not only in it, but was actually in everything, and while external to the universe, abode in His Father only.⁴⁰

On the other hand, does Athanasius elsewhere come close to implying that Christ had a human soul? In his interpretation of Joel 2:8, he says:

³⁷DI 8.3.

³⁸DI 8.2.

³⁹DI 21.7.

⁴⁰DI 17.2-4.

As then this is the sense of the above text, they all will reasonably condemn themselves who have thought that the flesh derived from Mary existed before her, and that the Word, prior to her, had a human soul, and existed in it always even before His coming.⁴¹

Without a doubt, Athanasius does, however, believe that the Logos is the creator of men's and women's souls:

For even when coupled with the body it [i.e., any man's or woman's soul] lived a life outside the body, much more shall its life continue after the death of the body, and living without ceasing by reason of God Who made it thus by His own Word, our Lord Jesus Christ.⁴²

But does the incarnate Logos have a soul of his own? This is an important question to which we shall return.

Christ's Human Solidarity

Men have been deified as a result of the Son becoming man. Athanasius says:

Therefore, if, even before the world was made, the Son had that glory and the Highest, and descended from heaven, and is ever to be worshiped, it follows that He had not promotion from His descent, but rather Himself promoted the things which needed promotion; and if He descended to effect their promotion, therefore He did not receive in reward the name of the Son and God, but rather He Himself has made us sons of the Father, and deified men by becoming Himself man.⁴³

The Son descended from heaven to effect our promotion and make us sons of the Father. Athanasius was very careful to state that not all humankind have been deified by the Son becoming man, qualifying the term "man" by the pronoun "us." Thus, Christians are deified by the Son becoming man.

⁴¹Athanasius, Ad Epictetum 8.

⁴²Athanasius, Contra Gentes II.33. Henceforth, this will be abbreviated CG.

⁴³CA I.11.38.

There are, according to Athanasius, two reasons why the Word became man for us. The first is that death may be destroyed and the resurrection of life may take place.⁴⁴ The second is that through the incarnation God gave men knowledge of himself so that they could know the Word, be rational, and live happy and blessed lives.⁴⁵ The argument behind this reasoning is that when God made humankind in his image and likeness, God gave them a share in Jesus Christ who is the image of the Father. So when the Word became flesh, men were able to get an idea of the Father and to know him. The knowledge of God was, then, acquired by human beings when the Word of God came in his own person and renewed man after God's image.⁴⁶

Christ's Death

Athanasius clearly affirms the bodily sacrifice of the incarnate Logos:

... by offering His own temple and corporeal instrument for the life of all [He] satisfied the debt by His death ... being conjoined with all by a like nature, [He] naturally clothed all with incorruption ...⁴⁷

Athanasius states that the body taken by the Word was capable of death in order that by giving it over to death, death might be conquered:

For the Word perceiving that not otherwise could corruption of men be undone save by death as necessary condition, while it was impossible for the Word to suffer death, being immortal, and Son of the Father; to this end He takes to Himself a body capable of death, that it, by partaking of the Word who is above all might be worthy to die in the stead of all, and might, because of the Word which was to dwell in it, remain incorruptible, and that thenceforth corruption

⁴⁴DI 10.5.

⁴⁵DI 11.3.

⁴⁶DI 11.3; 12.7.

⁴⁷DI 9.2.

might be stayed from all by the Grace of the Resurrection. Whence, by offering unto death the body He Himself had taken as an offering and sacrifice free from any stain straightaway He put away death from all His peers by the offering of an equivalent.⁴⁸

The body Christ took on was an instrument whereby the necessary condition of death to undo man's corruption could be met. For Athanasius understood that it was impossible for the Word to suffer since it is immortal and the Son of God. Therefore, he concludes that:

He takes Himself a body capable of death, that it, by partaking of the Word who is above all, might be worthy to die in the stead of all, and might, because of the Word which was come to dwell in it, remain incorruptible, and that thenceforth corruption might be stayed from all by the Grace of the resurrection.⁴⁹

Athanasius argues that Christ "suffers [death] not for His own sake, but for the immortality and salvation of all"⁵⁰ This apparent inconsistency colors his doctrine of union with all men.

Christ's Universal Relevance

For whom was this sacrifice made? Athanasius repeatedly stresses he accomplished "His sacrifice on behalf of all."⁵¹

He next offered up His sacrifice also on behalf of all, yielding His temple to

⁴⁸DI 9.1. Elsewhere Athanasius says: "And while, He, the incorporeal, was in the passible Body, the Body had the impassible Word, which was destroying the infirmities inherent in the Body. But this He did, and so it was, in order that Himself taking what was ours and offering it as a sacrifice, He might do away with it, and conversely might invest us what was His" (Athanasius, Ad Epictetum 6).

⁴⁹DI 9.1.

⁵⁰DI 34.1.

⁵¹DI 16.4.

death in the stead of all, in order firstly to make men quit and free of their old trespass.⁵²

"For there was need of death, and death must be suffered on behalf of all, that the debt owing from all might be paid."⁵³ He was the "common Savior and true Life of all."⁵⁴

However, it seems that Athanasius in this instance limits the "all" to "the Faithful." He says,

Why, now that the common Saviour of all has died on our behalf, we, the faithful in Christ, no longer die the death as before, agreeably to the warning of the law; for this condemnation has ceased; but, corruption ceasing and being put away by the grace of the Resurrection, henceforth we are only dissolved, agreeable to our bodies' mortal nature, at the time God has fixed for each, that we may be able to gain a better resurrection.⁵⁵

Conclusion

In our survey of Athanasian themes related to incarnational union with Christ, we have not even begun to resolve all the issues in this complex area of patrology. It is apparent, however, even from our brief overview that the concerns of Kelly--and, perhaps even to some extent, Grillmeier and Hanson--regarding Athanasius' views of Christ's humanity are hardly frivolous. G. C. Stead has carefully and fairly summarized these concerns about the Athanasian treatment of the role of Christ in the economy of salvation:

Athanasius's christology proclaims the divine Word operating in three spheres

⁵²DI 20.2.

⁵³DI 20.5.

⁵⁴DI 30.1.

⁵⁵DI 21.1. Athanasius also clearly uses "all men" in the sense of including human beings of all classes, races and countries. See DI 30.

(*Inc.* 17): he is eternally united to the Father; he governs the world which he created as Logos; thirdly, when the appointed time came, he was born as a man and united to our race. His significance is universal, and yet it is evident that he took the body of an individual man (*Inc.* 9, 17, 42), sanctified it, worked miracles through it and offered it in sacrifice. By emphasizing Christ's human body or flesh, A. can present man's lower nature as capable of salvation (whereas Platonists thought that only the rational soul survived), but he avoids declaring that the Word assumed a human soul; a gap partly filled by attributing conscious experience to the "flesh" (*Ar.* III, 37, 38, 57). In this way Christ's human powers and experiences are always described in physical terms; there is no place for his human faith (*Ar.* II, 6!) or obedience (*Ar.* I, 37, 38) or fear (*Ar.* III, 54), though his physical sufferings are of course acknowledged. His death meant only the separation of the Word from his body. A.'s slight concession to his Antiochene friends in the *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, left no trace in his subsequent teaching.⁵⁶

Thus, we are left questioning the approach of Torrance, Twombly, Dragas, and Hart.

What, then, of the soul of Christ in Athanasius? Most scholars in this century, including Hoss, Stulcken, Richard, Grillmeier, Kelly, and A. Louth, hold that the Alexandrian never mentions a human soul in Christ.⁵⁷ As Louth states:

It seems to me to be clear that Athanasius nowhere mentions a human soul in Christ explicitly and clearly. It also seems quite speculative as to whether Athanasius would have agreed with Apollinarius if he had to make up his mind.⁵⁸

He also argues:

In *Contra Gentes*, 33, Athanasius speaks of the soul as being bound to (*sundedetai*) its body. It is precisely this that Athanasius denies of the incarnate Logos in *DI* 17: *ou gar sundedeto to somati*. And it is in this chapter that Athanasius makes most explicit the parallelism of Logos-cosmos and Incarnate Logos-soma⁵⁹

⁵⁶Stead, *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, 1:94.

⁵⁷Twombly, "The Nature of Christ's Humanity," 228.

⁵⁸A. Louth, "Athanasius' Understanding of the Humanity of Christ," *Studia Patristica* 16 (1985): 309.

⁵⁹Louth, 310.

J. N. D. Kelly views this as no small quandary:

This brings us face to face with the central problem of his Christology, viz. whether he envisaged Christ's humanity as including a human rational soul, or regarded the Logos as taking the place of one. His anthropology, it should be pointed out, which was thoroughly Platonic and treated the soul as having no necessary connexion with the body, was perfectly consistent with the latter hypothesis His regular description of Christ's human nature as "flesh" or "body" seems to point in this direction, as does his failure to make any unambiguously clear mention of a soul.⁶⁰

Other scholars, such as Twombly, and earlier Voisin, agree with Torrance that Athanasius acknowledged a human soul in Christ. Torrance hones in on Athanasius' use of "flesh" in key texts, especially in Contra Arianos.⁶¹ According to Twombly:

Torrance . . . sees in the attribution of various mental and emotional qualities to the "flesh" a basis for affirming that Athanasius frequently uses "flesh," in a fashion reminiscent of the Bible, to mean full humanity, body, and soul⁶²

Twombly goes on to explain that Torrance utilizes

not so much the surface meanings of various passages as attempt[s] to penetrate behind these surfaces to the underlying theological reasoning that connects them and gives them their full meaning.⁶³

⁶⁰Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, 286-287.

⁶¹For an example of Torrance's interest in such passages, see Torrance, Theology in Reconciliation, 226, n. 2. Torrance uses many references from Contra Arianos III, whose authorship is highly disputed. Compare with Hanson, 418. Twombly also treats some of these same texts (Twombly, 238-241) but is more balanced in his treatment, admitting "how exceedingly tentative any conclusions must be which are erected on such a slender base" (Twombly, 238). In fairness to Torrance, it must also be noted that the post-362 A.D. writings attributed to Athanasius, from which on occasion he draws, have recently been used to argue in favor of Christ possessing a human soul. See Alvyn Pettersen, Athanasius (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1995), 130-132.

⁶²Twombly, 236.

⁶³Twombly, 237.

Without a doubt, to deny that Athanasius conceived of a soul in the humanity of Christ is an argument from silence, which is not usually considered strong. However, in this particular case, two facts need to be borne in mind. First, his argument against the Arians gave Athanasius every opportunity to affirm a human soul if he believed it.⁶⁴ Yet, as Kelly states:

... this obvious solution, as we have seen, never apparently occurred to him; instead he strained every nerve to attribute them to the flesh.⁶⁵

Second, early church fathers such as Irenaeus and Tertullian clearly professed that Christ had a soul.⁶⁶ And as Twombly summarizes:

Later patristic thinkers, whether "Antiochene" or "Alexandrian," agreed then on the presence of a human soul in Christ and merely differed on whether its role was largely active or passive. The soteriological issue, in either case, was seen as fundamental.⁶⁷

It seems reasonable to assume that Athanasius would consider a grid such as was previously employed by men like Irenaeus and Tertullian. But Louth suggests:

One of the motives behind his Christology is to avoid some of the pitfalls of Origenism, which may throw some light on his unwillingness to say much about Christ's human soul, about which Origen had said rather too much.⁶⁸

Regardless of how inconclusive one views this argument from silence, the very fact that the question can even be asked bears witness to the fact that Athanasius'

⁶⁴For a brief discussion of M. Richard's argumentation along these lines, see Twombly, 228; and Aloys Grillmeier, Christ in Christian Tradition (New York, 1965), 195-196.

⁶⁵Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, 287.

⁶⁶Twombly, 229.

⁶⁷Twombly, 231.

⁶⁸Louth, 309. For further discussion of Origen's view on Christ's soul, see Louth, 310-311.

doctrine of Christ's humanity is not as developed and systematic as some would like it to be. Caution is, therefore, in order, lest we discover in Athanasius a reflection of our own, more complex, post-Reformation christological constructs.

CHAPTER 3

JOHN CALVIN ON UNION WITH CHRIST

There is a sense, therefore, in which we must speak of all men as ingrafted into Christ in virtue of His incarnational and atoning work, and we must consequently speak of those who refuse Him and ultimately prove reprobate as those who break themselves off from Him. In Calvin's words, "that very relationship of the flesh, by which He has allied us to Himself, the ungodly break off and dissolve by their unbelief, so that it is by their own fault that they are rendered utter strangers to Him" (*Comm. on Ps. 22:23*). T. F. Torrance, *School of Faith*, cxvi-cxvii.

We know that the sons of God are born not of flesh and blood but of the Spirit through faith. The sharing of flesh alone does not produce brotherly communion. John Calvin, *Calvin's Ecclesiastical Advice*, 39-40.

This chapter sets out Calvin's doctrine of union with Christ in its broader theological context. First, modern discussion and debate concerning the doctrine in Calvin's thinking will be introduced. Next, I will introduce and analyze an important set of correspondence bearing upon the doctrine of union with Christ brought to light by a recent Calvin study. When exploring this correspondence, I will examine Calvin's doctrine in its several forms and facets, giving careful attention to the incarnation and union with Christ. Finally, the findings will be related to Calvin's wider corpus and theology, as well as current secondary treatments. Our concern throughout will be to discover the contours of Calvin's doctrine of union with Christ, especially as it is shaped by the incarnation. At every step, sensitivity to historical context and development will be maintained.

Background

Princeton Professor David Willis highlights the importance of the doctrine of union with Christ to the Reformer:

Calvin's doctrine of the union with Christ is one of the most consistently influential features of his theology and ethics, if not indeed the single most important teaching which animates the whole of his thought and his personal life.¹

Other studies have long stressed the importance of the doctrine of union with Christ in Calvin's theology.²

Willis identifies two different yet related levels within Calvin's doctrine of union with Christ--the first of which is incarnational and is described briefly:

¹D. Willis-Watkins, "The Unio Mystica and the Assurance of Faith According to Calvin," in Calvin: Erbe und Auftrag, Festschrift für W. H. Neuser, ed. Willem van't Spijker (Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1991), 78.

²For example, see John W. Nevin, The Mystical Presence (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1846), 54-58; Thomas Gregory, "Union to Christ the Ground of Justification," in Opening and Closing Addresses to the New College Theological Society, Session 1882-83 (Edinburgh: Lorimer & Gillies, 1883), 33-50, especially 38-39; W. Kolffhaus, Christusgemeinschaft bei Johannes Calvin, in Beiträge zur Geschichte und Lehre der Reformierten Kirche, vol. 3 (Neukirchen: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1939); Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics IV/3.2, ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, trans. G. W. Bromiley (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1962), 551-553; W. Niesel, The Theology of Calvin, trans. H. Knight (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956), 120-126; Paul van Buren, Christ in Our Place (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1957), 95-106; R. S. Wallace, Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1959), 17-27; W. Niesel, Reformed Symbolics, trans. D. Lewis (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1962), 181-186; F. Wendel, Calvin: Origins and Development of His Religious Thought, trans. P. Mairet (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), 234-242; Kilian McDonnell, John Calvin, the Church, and the Eucharist (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967), 177-205; Charles Partee, "Calvin, Calvinism, and Philosophy: A Prolusion," Reformed Review 33 (1980): 129-135; Charles Partee, "Calvin's Central Dogma Again," Sixteenth Century Journal 18 (1987): 191-199; John H. Leith, John Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1989), 98-103; Jean-Daniel Benoit, Calvin in His Letters, trans. R. Haig, in Courtenay Studies in Reformation Theology, no. 5 (Oxford: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1991), 73-81.

There is the incarnation, the hypostatic union of the eternal Word with the humanity which believers share with every other person. The 'communication of properties' applies to this level, the hypostatic union. This level of union is primarily the subject in *Institutes* II, chapters 13 and 14.³

The second level of union with Christ is particular and limited to believers only.⁴ But it does not stand on its own:

This particular union--I repeat--presupposes the prior union. It is the way believers have applied to them the salvation wrought by 'the whole course of obedience' (*Institutes* II 16, 5) of Jesus Christ, the eternal Word united to humanity.⁵

Although Willis' statement is grammatically ambiguous, the wider context makes it plain that for Calvin the particular union applies the salvation made possible only by the prior incarnation.⁶ The limited scope of his Festschrift article prevents a detailed treatment, but Willis does note that it is important to recognize the two levels function together in Calvin's theology.⁷

As noted in Chapter 1, Professor T. F. Torrance, in the introduction to his The School of Faith, touches upon the doctrine of union with Christ in response to George

³Willis-Watkins, 78.

⁴Willis-Watkins, 78-79: "There is, secondly, the particular union of Christ with believers which comes about by the Holy Spirit who is the bond by which we are united to Christ (*Institutes* III 1, 1), the eternal Word made flesh. This is the reality which Calvin, in a subsequent section (III 11, 10), calls 'that conjunction of the Head and members, the indwelling of Christ in our hearts, the mystical union.'"

⁵Willis-Watkins, 79.

⁶Wilhelm Niesel put it memorably: "The miracle of Christmas must be followed by the miracle of Pentecost if the former is to reach its goal in us." Niesel, Reformed Symbolics, 184.

⁷Willis-Watkins, 78: "To understand what Calvin means by it [i.e., union with Christ], we must note the difference between two levels of that union. The second or consequent level of union presupposes the prior or first level of union."

S. Hendry's analysis of Calvin. In his rebutal to Hendry's analysis of Calvin, Torrance gives his own understanding of Calvin on union with Christ:

There is a sense, therefore, in which we must speak of all men as ingrafted into Christ in virtue of His incarnational and atoning work, and we must consequently speak of those who refuse Him and ultimately prove reprobate as those who break themselves off from Him. In Calvin's words, 'that very relationship of the flesh, by which He has allied us to Himself, the ungodly break off and dissolve by their unbelief, so that it is by their own fault that they are rendered utter strangers to Him' (*Comm. on Ps. 22:23*).⁸

Torrance sees in Calvin a universal union with all men via the incarnation whereby they are ingrafted into Christ.⁹

The most helpful study of Calvin's doctrine of union with Christ to date is by Dennis E. Tamburello.¹⁰ Computer word searches of key terms in the 1559 Institutes

⁸Torrance, School of Faith, cxvi-cxvii. Tony Lane takes exception with Torrance here, saying: "The idea of the headship of Christ over all men is a Barthian idea alien to Calvin." A. N. S. Lane, "The Quest for the Historical Calvin," Evangelical Quarterly 60 (1983), 113.

⁹In an interview with this author, Torrance expanded on this theme: "Calvin . . . says there is a threefold ingrafting into Christ and a twofold cutting off, [which is] a very interesting expression. . . . Now, what is this threefold grafting in? One graft is Christ--we were just speaking about it--he became man and takes all humanity. That's a grafting into Christ, a fundamental grafting into Christ. The other one is baptism. . . . And following, . . . faith" (Torrance, interview by author, 29 January 1990, Edinburgh, tape recording). Torrance mentions Calvin's doctrine of threefold ingrafting and twofold breaking off in T. F. Torrance, Kingdom and Church (London: Oliver & Boyd, 1956), 102, n. 3.

¹⁰Dennis E. Tamburello, "Christ and Mystical Union: A Comparative Study of the Theologies of Bernard of Clairvaux and John Calvin" (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1990). This dissertation was written under the supervision of Brian A. Gerrish at the University of Chicago Divinity School. This study was later published as Union with Christ: John Calvin and the Mysticism of St. Bernard (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994). All further citations of Tamburello's study will be to the published work.

provide the starting point of Tamburello's study.¹¹ In addition to this material, Tamburello takes many important cues from Kolffhaus' earlier study and the primary sources it cites.¹²

Wilhelm Kolffhaus' work covers John Calvin's doctrine of union with Christ in detail, making it the fullest single treatment to date.¹³ After a historical survey of German thought on Calvin's doctrine, Kolffhaus grapples with the question at hand-- "Was ist Christusgemeinschaft?"¹⁴

Kolffhaus turns first to the primary source he considers to be most important-- Calvin's letter of 8 August 1555 to Peter Martyr.¹⁵ Several pages are devoted merely

¹¹Tamburello, 84 and 141, n. 1. These word searches were performed on a database at the H. H. Meeter Center for Calvin Studies in Grand Rapids, Michigan, which was originally prepared by Ford Lewis Battles and later revised by Richard F. Wevers. The results of this search are contained in an appendix to the book, "Appendix: References to Union with Christ in the 1559 Institutes and Other Selected Calvin Texts." Tamburello, 111-113.

¹²On Kolffhaus, see footnote 2 above. Tamburello refers to Kolffhaus no less than 35 times in his 40-page chapter "John Calvin on Mystical Union." Kolffhaus' citations of Calvin's writings are included in Tamburello's word search list. Tamburello does not draw, however, uncritically from Kolffhaus' earlier work.

¹³Kolffhaus' study has received wide attention. See, for example, Niesel, The Theology of Calvin, 120; Wallace, Doctrine of the Christian Life, 341; Wendel, 234; Partee, "Calvin's Central Dogma Again," 197; Willis-Watkins, 78.

¹⁴Other than references to a dozen notable German scholars, Kolffhaus only deals very briefly with the opinions of three Dutch writers on Calvin's doctrine of union with Christ--Abraham Kuyper, Herman Bavinck, and S. P. Dee. His list of German worthies includes Heinrich Heppe, Ernst Troeltsch, Wilhelm Niesel, and Reinhold Seeberg.

¹⁵John Calvin, "2266. Calvinus Vermilio (8 August 1555)," Ioannis Calvini Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia, vol. 15, ed. G. Baum, E. Cunitz, and E. Reuss, in Corpus Reformatorum, vol. 43 (Brunsvigae: C. A. Schwetschke et Filium, 1876), 722-725. Hereafter all volumes in this series will be designated by CO followed by the volume and page numbers. For English translations of extracts of this letter, see John Calvin, "Calvin to Martyr, Geneva, August 8, 1555," in Gleanings of a Few Scattered Ears, ed.

to a German translation of a major extract from this Latin letter. The balance of the chapter marshals numerous other passages from Calvin's corpus to illustrate and clarify the letter to Martyr.¹⁶ Tamburello also gives attention to Calvin's letter to Martyr, his original interest apparently stirred by Kolfhaus.¹⁷

The importance of this 8 August 1555 letter for Calvin's doctrine of union with Christ, however, does not appear to be widely appreciated in English language Calvin studies.¹⁸ Perhaps this is because Beveridge's extract oddly omits the bulk of the letter, which treats the doctrine.¹⁹

G. C. Gorham (London: Bell and Daldy, 1857), 349-352; and John Calvin, "To Peter Martyr," Selected Works of John Calvin: Tracts and Letters, vol. 6, ed. Henry Beveridge and Jules Bonnet, trans. M. R. Gilchrist (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1983), 217-218. Gorham's extract omits only Calvin's opening remarks and closing church news. All English citations of this letter will be drawn from Gorham and designated as "Calvin to Martyr," unless specified otherwise. Beveridge's extract only gives Calvin's closing church news.

¹⁶Kolfhaus, 24-35.

¹⁷After quoting the Latin text of the letter, Tamburello references Kolfhaus. See Tamburello, 87 and 143, n. 18. Only one other secondary source cited by Tamburello mentions this letter, and then just once in passing. See R. S. Wallace, Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1953), 146, n. 5. Tamburello does not refer to this footnote in Wallace.

¹⁸Other than Kolfhaus' German volume, none of the works on Calvin's doctrine of union with Christ cited in footnote 2 above mentions the letter. Although Kolfhaus' work itself is not unknown, the only other references to the letter in Calvin studies material in the English tongue that I have found are made by Tamburello and his academic supervisor. See B. A. Gerrish, Tradition and the Modern World: Reformed Theology in the Nineteenth Century (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1978), 63. This is in a chapter on J. W. Nevin's treatment of Calvin on the Lord's Supper. See also the more recent volume, B. A. Gerrish, Grace and Gratitude: The Eucharistic Theology of John Calvin (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993), 128-129. Professor Gerrish kindly first drew my attention to this letter while he was in Edinburgh delivering these Cunningham Lectures at New College in 1989.

¹⁹It is not immediately obvious in Beveridge's edition that the letter as given is only a small extract. See Calvin, Tracts and Letters, vol. 6, 217-218. Gorham's 1857

Calvin's letter to Martyr deals almost exclusively with the doctrine of union with Christ²⁰ and ends on this informative note:

Were I teaching any other person, I should follow up this subject more diffusely; in addressing you, I have glanced at it briefly, with the simple view of showing you that we entirely agree in sentiment.²¹

Thus, Calvin's letter dated as 8 August 1555 was in fact a response to Martyr's own views on the subject expressed at an earlier date.²²

This fuller set of correspondence between Calvin and Martyr is better known in secondary works on Peter Martyr.²³ Only in the past few decades has there been a reawakening of scholarly interest in Peter Martyr Vermigli.²⁴ That John Calvin and

volume is more obscure than Beveridge's, and his fuller English extract consequently appears to be little known.

²⁰"Although I promised to write to you, on the secret Communion which we have with Christ, yet I shall not treat this subject so largely as you hoped: nevertheless, as the matter is one of vast importance, I think it may be profitable to state my opinion definitely in a few words." Calvin to Martyr, 349 [CO 15:722].

²¹Calvin to Martyr, 352 [CO 15:724].

²²Kolfhaus, Tamburello, and Gerrish do not display any awareness of this fact. They fail to employ Martyr's letter as important background material for the interpretation of Calvin's response.

²³For example, see M. W. Anderson, Peter Martyr: A Reformer in Exile (1542-1562) (Nieuwkoop: B. De Graaf, 1975), 186-195, especially 187-189; M. W. Anderson, "Peter Martyr, Reformed Theologian (1542-1562): His letters to Heinrich Bullinger and John Calvin," Sixteenth Century Journal 4 (1973): 41-64, especially 58; J. C. McLelland, The Visible Words of God (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1957), 88, 14-147, especially 143-146.

²⁴The first major study of Martyr in English was completed at the instigation and under the supervision of T. F. Torrance: Joseph C. McLelland, "The Doctrine of the Sacraments in the Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli (A.D. 1500-1562)," Ph.D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 1953, which was later published in 1957 under the title The Visible Words of God. Philip McNair, Peter Martyr in Italy (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), vii. On Martyr also see J. C. McClelland [sic], "The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination," Scottish Journal of Theology 8 (1955): 255-271; M. W. Anderson,

Peter Martyr Vermigli held each other in highest esteem is now beyond question.²⁵

Martyr's letter to Calvin that prompted the above reply is dated 8 March 1555.²⁶ After briefly discussing the tragic case of an unnamed theologian who "does not honestly admit the doctrine of Predestination," Martyr turns to union with Christ,

"Peter Martyr, Reformed Theologian (1542-1562)," 1973; M. W. Anderson, "Peter Martyr on Romans," Scottish Journal of Theology 26 (1973): 401-420; M. W. Anderson, Peter Martyr, 1975; John Patrick Donnelly, Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976); J. C. McLelland, "Calvinism Perfecting Thomism? Peter Martyr Vermigli's Question," Scottish Journal of Theology 31 (1978): 571-578; J. C. McLelland, "Peter Martyr Vermigli: Scholastic or Humanist?" in Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian Reform, ed. J. C. McLelland (Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1980); Robert M. Kingdon, The Political Thought of Peter Martyr Vermigli (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1980). For a helpful new primary and secondary bibliography of Martyr, see J. P. Donnelly, R. M. Kingdon, and M. W. Anderson, A Bibliography of the Works of Peter Martyr Vermigli (Kirkville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1990).

²⁵As Anderson puts it: "One must concur with Peter Martyr, that he and John Calvin were as closely joined in mind and judgment as were any other pair of theologians in sixteenth-century Europe" (Anderson, "Peter Martyr, Reformed Theologian [1542-1562]," 1973, 63). Anderson also notes that the 1576 Latin edition of Calvin's Institutio Christianae Religionis published by Thomas Vautrollerius includes marginal apparatus referring to Martyr! Anderson, "Peter Martyr, Reformed Theologian (1542-1562)," 1973, 55.

²⁶Peter Martyr Vermigli, Letter to John Calvin, 8 March 1555, Loci Communis Petri Martyris Vermilii Florentini Theologi Celeberrimi (Geneva: Pierre Aubert, 1627), 767-769. All future citations from the Loci Communis will be taken from this edition and abbreviated LC, followed by the page number. An English edition is found in Peter Martyr Vermigli, Common Places of the most famous and renowned Divine Doctor Peter Martyr, divided into foure principall parts, with Appendix, trans. Anthony Marten (London: H. Denham and H. Middleton, 1583), 96-99. Anthony Marten's 1583 English edition, Common Places, will be used, as will his page numbering scheme. It will be abbreviated CP, followed by part number in brackets and then page number. A new translation of a major extract of the letter is also found in Peter Martyr Vermigli, "Martyr to Calvin, Strasburgh, March 8, 1555," in Gleanings of a Few Scattered Ears, ed. G. C. Gorham, 340-344. All English citations of this letter below will be taken from Gorham and designated as "Martyr to Calvin," unless specified otherwise.

inviting Calvin's own opinion on the matter.²⁷

Men do not all agree concerning the communion which we have with the Body of Christ and the substance of His nature; for what reason, I suppose you will hear. It is of much importance that he that is Christ's should understand the manner of His union with Him.²⁸

Martyr concludes by kindly declining Calvin's previous offer of employment as pastor of the Italian congregation in Geneva.²⁹

Peter Martyr may not, however, be the Reformer who first raised the issue of union with Christ that prompted this correspondence. As G. C. Gorham notes at the end of Martyr's 8 March 1555 letter to Calvin:

There is a long and interesting letter, on the same subject, to Beza . . . without date, but probably written at the same time as this to Calvin³⁰

That Gorham associates Martyr's letter to Calvin with Martyr's letter to Beza is of little surprise.³¹ Some internal evidence suggests that Martyr's letter to Beza antedates his

²⁷Martyr to Calvin, 341-342.

²⁸Martyr to Calvin, 342. The ambiguous double capitalization is Gorham's. Perhaps Andreas Osiander is the reason Martyr has in mind.

²⁹Martyr, CP [Appendix], 98-99.

³⁰Martyr to Calvin, 344 (editor's note). See LC, 777-778. A full English translation is found in CP [Appendix], 105-106. All English citations below will be taken from Marten's edition of the CP and designated as "Martyr to Beza," unless specified otherwise. The original Latin text may also be had in modern typeface. See Theodore Beza, Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze, vol. 1, ed. F. Aubert and H. Meylan (Geneva: Libraire E. Droz, 1960), 153-155.

³¹In structure, content, and phrasing the two are remarkably similar. At the close of the letter, Martyr mentions his colleague Zanchius, suggesting a dating in his second Strasbourg period of 1553-1556. See McLelland, Visible Words of God, 143, n. 11. Anderson agrees with Gorham's judgement by assigning to the letter from Martyr to Beza, based on internal criteria alone, a date of 8 March 1555. See Anderson, Peter Martyr, 475.

letter to Calvin.³²

Like Calvin, Peter Martyr did not offer his views on union with Christ unsolicited. It is clear from Martyr's letter to Beza that Beza first inquired of Martyr on the doctrine!³³ Although one cannot conclude definitely that Beza's letter to Martyr preceded Martyr's letter to Calvin, the continuity between them makes both letters important background material for understanding Calvin's own comments and views on the doctrine of union with Christ.³⁴

Building on Tamburello's study, I propose to re-examine Calvin's doctrine of union with Christ in light of Peter Martyr's fuller correspondence on the subject.³⁵

Findings on incarnational union will be checked with Calvin's Institutes and relevant

³²Martyr's letter to Calvin displays a tighter, crisper style. Near the end of his letter to Beza, Martyr repeats himself, giving extra illustrations in what appears to be an attempt to clarify his position. In the letter to Calvin, Martyr's critique of Cyril of Alexandria is more fully developed and substantial than in his letter to Beza. Perhaps these differences only reflect a greater degree of informality and familiarity with Beza. However, Martyr's letter to Beza appears to be more of a "first draft" on the subject.

³³Martyr begins confessing to Beza, "I should have long ago answered your two learned and courteous letters." After briefly criticizing a manuscript on predestination prepared by Beza as lacking sufficient scriptural documentation, Martyr devotes the bulk of the letter to union with Christ: "It now remains that I should answer those things which you demand as touching our communion with Christ" (Martyr to Beza, 105). Beza's original two letters of inquiry now unfortunately have been lost. See Beza, 55, n. 1.

³⁴Martyr forms something of an historical bridge between Calvin and Beza on the subject of union with Christ. As in Calvin's 8 August 1555 letter, Martyr ends his letter to Beza on an unmistakable note of continuity: "Between our two opinions there is but a little or no difference at all" (Martyr to Beza, 106.) Beza had obviously outlined his own understanding of the doctrine in his previous letter to Martyr, sadly no longer extant.

³⁵For an analysis of Martyr's letters to Calvin and Beza, as well as tracing of the themes in these letters through the balance of Martyr's corpus, see Appendix 13.

commentary passages. Lastly, our conclusions will be contrasted with a more extensive examination of recent Calviniana secondary literature on the subject.

Calvin's Response to Martyr

As previously mentioned, Kolffhaus and Tamburello consider the letter of 8 August 1555 from Calvin to Martyr to be perhaps the most important data available for unpacking Calvin's doctrine of union with Christ. In light of Martyr's letters and teaching, then, we will seek new insights into Calvin's doctrine, building on previous modern studies.

In his study, Tamburello describes "a twofold communion with Christ" in Calvin's writings, especially in Calvin's 8 August 1555 letter.³⁶ These two kinds of union with Christ are mystical union and spiritual union. To these two we will turn first.

Mystical Communion with Christ

Tamburello notes that the term unio mystica is used by Calvin in only two places in the Institutes.³⁷ The most important is found in Institutes III.11.10:

Therefore, that joining together of Head and members, that indwelling of Christ in our hearts--in short, that mystical union--are accorded by us the highest degree of importance, so that Christ, having been made ours, makes us sharers with him in the gifts with which he has been endowed. We do not, therefore, contemplate him outside ourselves from afar in order that his righteousness

³⁶"Another important reference to this twofold communion is found in a letter of Calvin to Peter Martyr. Again Calvin speaks of two communions with Christ: the first communion is that Christ lives in us through the power of the Spirit. . . . [T]he second communion, whereby Christ makes us rich in spiritual gifts. . . . It is interesting to note that this second communion 'grows' whereas the first is 'total.'" Tamburello, 86-87.

³⁷Tamburello, 84.

may be imputed to us but because we put on Christ and are engrafted into his body--in short, because he deigns to make us one with him. For this reason, we glory that we have fellowship of righteousness with him.³⁸

Although he does not use the title "mystical union," John Calvin opens his letter to Peter Martyr of 8 August 1555 with a detailed discussion of

that communion which flows from His heavenly influence, and breathes life into us, and makes us to coalesce into one body with Himself.³⁹

It is clear that this section in Calvin's letter is describing what he later calls "mystical union."⁴⁰

³⁸Calvin, *Institutes* (1559) III.11.10 (737). *CO* 2:540: "Coniunctio igitur illa capitis et membrorum, habitatio Christi in cordibus nostris, mystica denique unio a nobis in summo gradu statuatur, ut Christus noster factus, donorum quibus praeditus est nos faciat consortes. Non ergo eum extra nos procul speculamur, ut nobis imputetur eius iustitia; sed quia ipsum induimus, et insiti sumus in eius corpus, unum denique nos secum efficere dignatus est, ideo iustitiae societatem nobis cum eo esse gloriamur." The other reference to "mystical union" is less descriptive: Calvin, *Institutes* (1559) II.12.7 (473) [*CO* 2:258].

³⁹Calvin to Martyr, 349 [*CO* 15:722-723].

⁴⁰The section in the *Institutes* on mystical union quoted above was added to the 1559 edition and did not appear in earlier editions. In the French translation, Calvin does not call it a mystical union but a *union sacrée* (Calvin, *Institutes* [1559] III.11.10, 737 n. 20; and *CO* 4:238). On the medical duress under which Calvin oversaw this translation and related issues, see Wendel, 118-119. In this letter Calvin describes this degree of union with Christ as the "sacred unity." Tamburello agrees that this first section in Calvin's letter to Martyr deals with mystical union (Tamburello, 86-87). Did Martyr's prior designation of "mystical communion" in his letter of 1555 prompt Calvin's language in the 1559 *Institutes*? See footnote 51 above. Gerrish is convinced that Calvin's intent in using "mystical" is straightforward: "Calvin meant no more by the actual word *mysticus* than simply 'mysterious.' Hence he can equally well use the adjective 'secret' or 'wonderful' to characterize our communion with Christ. 'Mystical' was perhaps suggested to him by his favorite biblical proof for union with Christ: Ephesians 5:28-33. . . . This, I think, is all Calvin means by calling our union or communication with Christ 'mystical.'" Gerrish, *Grace and Gratitude*, 72-73. This Gerrish's observation is not spoiled by the criticisms of his book by T. H. L. Parker, Review of *Grace and Gratitude: The Eucharistic Theology of John Calvin* by B. A. Gerrish, in *Journal of Theological Studies* 45 (1994): 771-775.

As in Martyr, only the regenerate are said to enjoy this high level of union with Christ:

But I affirm, that, as soon as we receive Christ by faith, as He offers Himself to us in the Gospel, we are truly made His members, and His life flows to us from Him as from our Head. For He reconciles us to God by the sacrifice of His death, in no other way than as He is ours and we are one with Him.⁴¹

It is "the faithful" who "are called into the Communion (κοινωνία) of His [Son]

... "⁴² Calvin does not leave the door open to a broadening of this level of union to include the unregenerate.

Calvin employs the Johannine imagery of a vine and branches to delineate mystical communion, just as Peter Martyr did before him.⁴³ The outcome of this ingrafting is that "He is ours and we are one with Him."⁴⁴ In direct effect of this incorporation into Christ, "life flows from Him to us in the same manner as the root transmits sap to the branches."⁴⁵ This is why mystical communion can only be posited of the regenerate--for the benefits of Christ's life and death only apply to those united to him by mystical communion.⁴⁶

Calvin's main concern is to stress this life of Christ that becomes ours through

⁴¹Calvin to Martyr, 349-350 [CO 15:723].

⁴²Calvin to Martyr, 350 [CO 15:723].

⁴³Calvin denominates this image variously, but the language of ingrafting is one of his favorites. See Calvin to Martyr, 350-351 [CO 15:722-723], especially Calvin's phrases facit ut in unum cum ipso corpus coalescamus and filius Dei nos in corpus suum inserit.

⁴⁴Calvin to Martyr, 350 [CO 15:723].

⁴⁵Calvin to Martyr, 350 [CO 15:723].

⁴⁶Hence, mystical union "breathes life into us." Calvin to Martyr, 349 [CO 15:723].

mystical communion.⁴⁷ Christ's "life is transfused from heaven to earth" via mystical communion.⁴⁸ The redeemed enjoy that

sacred unity by which the Son of God engrafts us into His body, so that He communicates to us all that is His. We so draw life from his flesh and blood, that they are not improperly called our food.⁴⁹

Calvin does not spell out the precise nature of this life. He does say, however, Christ comes "to dwell in us, to sustain us, to quicken us, and to fulfil all the offices of the Head."⁵⁰

How does this mystical communion occur? Calvin leaves that question not fully resolved:

How that is done, is, I confess, far deeper than the measure of my understanding; and, therefore, I rather receive this mystery, than labour to comprehend it⁵¹

He does, however, affirm the intimate involvement of the Holy Spirit in the event. It is the Spirit who transmits Christ's life in heaven down to earth.⁵² The physical distance between the heavenly Saviour and his people must, therefore, be overcome by the Holy

⁴⁷While Calvin's letter includes a distinct section on mystical communion, does he not here threaten to get ahead of himself? No longer is he only pointing to the act of incorporation, by which Christ's life is made the believer's for the first time, but Calvin hints that this incorporation produces an ongoing effect, which he treats more fully in the next section of his letter when discussing spiritual communion. See Calvin to Martyr, 350-351.

⁴⁸Calvin to Martyr, 350 [CO 15:723].

⁴⁹Calvin to Martyr, 350 [CO 15:723].

⁵⁰Calvin to Martyr, 350 [CO 15:723]. Calvin's allusion to "the offices of the Head" may well refer to his doctrines of the Mediator and the triplex munus.

⁵¹Calvin to Martyr, 350 [CO 15:723].

⁵²Calvin to Martyr, 350 [CO 15:723]: ". . . life is transfused from heaven to earth by the Divine influence of the Spirit"

Spirit.⁵³ Calvin goes so far as to say that Christ's very flesh would not be life-giving without the concomitant work of the Spirit.⁵⁴

Like Peter Martyr, John Calvin is convinced that any notion of a crass mixture of substance with Christ is wrong.⁵⁵ Calvin extends Martyr's criticism of Cyril of Alexandria for immoderately using "hyperbolical expressions" to also include Hilary of Poitiers:

But though I see that the ancients, especially Hilary and Cyril were carried much too far, yet I am not disposed severely to censure their hyperbolas, except when it is sought to prop up error by their authority, an attempt to which I always distinctly oppose myself. . . . Still, provided these new fusionists do not thrust their authority upon us, I shall be satisfied in not subscribing, and I shall not voluntarily drag them into the arena.⁵⁶

Clearly, Calvin was agreeing with Martyr that these Fathers had "afforded a large

⁵³Calvin to Martyr, 350 [CO 15:724]: ". . . nor could its efficacy reach as far as us, except through the immense operation of the Spirit." Calvin is here providing an alternative to the Lutheran notion of ubiquity.

⁵⁴Calvin to Martyr, 350 [CO 15:723]: ". . . life is transfused from heaven to earth by the Divine influence of the Spirit; for, neither could the flesh of Christ be life-giving by itself, nor could its efficacy reach as far as us, except through the immense operation of the Spirit. Hence it is the Spirit who makes Christ to dwell in us, to sustain us, to quicken us, and to fulfil all the offices of the Head." Calvin does not say why the flesh of Christ could not be life-giving by itself. But it is clear that this limitation of the efficacy of Christ's flesh and dependance on the Spirit conflicts with the Lutheran concept of the ubiquity of Christ's body, as well as the Roman Catholic concept of transubstantiation, which places life-giving grace and the means of its conveyance in the physical flesh of Christ itself. See also John Calvin, Tracts, trans. Henry Beveridge, ed. Henry Beveridge and Jules Bonnet, vol 2: Containing Treatises on the Sacraments, Catechism of the Church of Geneva, Forms of Prayer, and Confessions of Faith (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1849; reprint ed., Selected Works of John Calvin: Tracts and Letters, vol. 2, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1983), 563 [CO 9:511-512].

⁵⁵See also Calvin, Tracts, 2:535 [CO 9:490-491].

⁵⁶Calvin to Martyr, 350 [CO 15:723]. See also Calvin, Tracts, 2:540-541 [CO 9:494-495].

handle to many errors."⁵⁷ Calvin, however, appears reticent to disagree publicly with these Fathers, who "were carried much too far," unless driven to it by "these new fusionists."⁵⁸ Calvin is satisfied disagreeing with the "wretchedly obscure position, that we also are of the same essence with Christ."⁵⁹

Calvin and Vermigli plainly saw eye-to-eye on mystical communion with Christ. Both affirm that it is a degree of union proper to regenerate Christians alone. Both agree in using Johannine ingrafting language for this level of union, firmly linking the efficacy of Christ's flesh to the spiritual status of the regenerate. Both point to the Holy Spirit as a key player in the mystical event. Both are opposed to notions of a mixture of substance between Christ and believers, even when found among certain Church Fathers. Neither sees this degree of communion with Christ as the only one operating in the lives of Christian believers.

⁵⁷Martyr to Calvin, 344.

⁵⁸Calvin's hesitation to disagree publicly with these ancient authorities conspicuously contrasts with Torrance's assertions about Calvin's use of the Fathers. While Augustine was cited most frequently by Calvin, Torrance maintains that this was mainly for apologetic purposes, since he was the magister theologiae of his day. For the true source behind Calvin's teaching, Torrance points to the Eastern Fathers and those influenced by them, such as Hilary. See T. F. Torrance, "The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, Gregory Nazianzen and John Calvin," Sobornost 12 (1990): 7-8; and T. F. Torrance, The Hermeneutics of John Calvin (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1988), 82. The "fusionists" Calvin has in mind doubtless include Andreas Osiander and his followers, who opposed Melancthon's doctrine of imputation, positing instead that the essential divine righteousness of Christ was the believer's. See Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.12.4-7 (467-474) [CO 2:342-347] and III.11.5-12 (729-743) [CO 2:536-545]; and Calvin, Tracts, 2:535, 547.

⁵⁹Calvin to Martyr, 351 [CO 15:723].

Spiritual Communion with Christ

The second kind of union that Calvin discusses in his letter to Peter Martyr is also by action of the Holy Spirit and is closely related to the first. This level of communion is again only for regenerate believers. It cannot be separated from the former mysterious type, of which it is "the fruit and effect":

For after that Christ, by the interior influence of His Spirit, has bound us to Himself and united us to His Body, *He exerts a second influence of His Spirit, enriching us by His gifts.*⁶⁰

The balance of Calvin's treatment of spiritual union centers upon the gifts that believers enjoy through it.

Calvin weaves a list of spiritual gifts that the justified enjoy into a beautifully moving passage, doubtless the most memorable of the letter:

Hence,--that we are strong in hope and patience,--that we soberly and temperately keep ourselves from worldly snares,--that we strenuously bestir ourselves to the subjugation of carnal affections,--that the love of righteousness and piety flourishes in us,--that we are earnest in prayer,--that meditation on the life to come draws us upwards,--this, I maintain, flows from that second Communion, by which Christ, dwelling in us not ineffectually, brings forth the influence of His Spirit in His manifest gifts.⁶¹

As a dynamic and progressive relation, spiritual union with Christ is clearly bound up intimately with the Christian walk. Such manifold blessings are not absurd, Calvin argues, because by mystical communion "we coalesce into His body": mystical

⁶⁰Calvin to Martyr, 351 [CO 15:723]. Because Calvin stresses that this second communion is by the action of the Holy Spirit, we shall designate it "spiritual communion." However, this should not be taken in an exclusive sense, as if mystical communion were not also accomplished by action of the Holy Spirit.

⁶¹Calvin to Martyr, 351 [CO 15:723].

communion is the rationale behind giving them.⁶² Spiritual union is the means by which "the life of Christ increases" in believers and "He daily offers Himself to be enjoyed by them."⁶³ To this level of union with Christ, Calvin assigns the Lord's Supper.⁶⁴

Though not every phrase and line of reasoning is identical, Calvin and Martyr do appear to coincide remarkably in their understanding of the believer's union with Christ. Both degrees of union are peculiar to Christians only. While Martyr emphasizes that spiritual union makes one "Christ-shaped," Calvin extends his Johannine ingrafting theme, stressing the sap--"the life of Christ"--that can be ours in greater measure through spiritual union.

Both Calvin and Martyr agree that mystical communion must lie behind the daily experience of spiritual communion with Christ in a believer's life. Mystical communion is a definitive event in the lives of the elect, while spiritual communion is an ongoing, progressive relation.⁶⁵ Thus, mystical communion grounds justification,

⁶²Calvin to Martyr, 351. CO 13:722-723: "Nam de ea tantum agendum est quae a coelesti eius virtute manat et nobis vitam inspirat, et facit ut in unum cum ipso corpus coalescamus." This is reminiscent of Martyr's argument that mystical union must be "prior, in nature at least, if not in time" to spiritual union. See footnotes 53 and 54 above.

⁶³Calvin to Martyr, 351-352 [CO 15:724].

⁶⁴Calvin to Martyr, 352 [CO 15:724]: "This is the Communion which they receive in the Sacred Supper." Gerrish notes that here Calvin assigns the Eucharist more to spiritual communion rather than mystical communion: ". . . Calvin does seem to intend at least a relative difference of function between preaching and the Eucharist: the first [mystical] communication is associated chiefly with the gospel, the second [spiritual communication] chiefly with the Sacrament." Gerrish, Grace and Gratitude, 129.

⁶⁵Tamburello has analyzed the correlation between this twofold communion and Calvin's doctrines of justification and sanctification (see Tamburello, 86-87). "It is

while spiritual communion appears to ground sanctification.⁶⁶

How successful is Calvin in distinguishing between these two types of communion with Christ? Admittedly, the terminology involved can be rather cumbersome. Mystical communion is no less "mysterious" than spiritual communion, and in turn, spiritual communion is no less "of the Spirit" than mystical communion!⁶⁷ Nevertheless, it is clear that Calvin does distinguish between these two communions in his letter of 8 August 1555.⁶⁸ To his mind, they are distinct yet inseparable concepts, each brought about by a separate influence of the Holy Spirit.

Yet why does Calvin draw such a distinction between mystical and spiritual communion? He feels compelled by Scripture itself:

Nor is it absurd, that Christ, when we coalesce into His Body, communicates to us His Spirit, by whose secret operation He first was made ours; since

interesting to note that this second communion 'grows' whereas the first is 'total.' This corresponds exactly to Calvin's theology of justification and sanctification. Just as justification for Calvin is always total while sanctification is always partial, so our participation in Christ's righteousness is total while the union of regeneration is partial." Tamburello, 87.

⁶⁶Calvin's famous statement in the Institutes on the unio mystica makes clear his intention to ground the imputed righteousness of Christ on mystical communion. See footnote 72 above; and Alister E. McGrath, Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification, vol. 2: From 1500 to the Present Day (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 1986, 36-38.

⁶⁷Even Calvin stumbles over himself in discussing these two types of the believer's union with Christ. See footnote 81 above. Perhaps this awkwardness is the reason Calvin fails to strictly label these two communions in his letter. See footnotes 74 and 94.

⁶⁸He makes this abundantly evident when first introducing spiritual communion: "I come now to a second Communion, which, as I think, is the fruit and effect of the former. For after that Christ, by the interior of His Spirit, has bound us to Himself and united us to His Body, *He exerts a second influence of His Spirit, enriching us by His gifts.*" Calvin to Martyr, 351 [CO 15:723].

Scripture often assigns both offices to Him.⁶⁹

While Calvin does not here specify the biblical passages that delineate these two offices to Christ, it is at least clear that Christ's headship and office as king are juxtaposed with his giving of the Holy Spirit and office as prophet.⁷⁰ He distinguishes between mystical and spiritual communion in the same way he distinguishes Christ and his gifts, or justification and sanctification.⁷¹

Both Tamburello and Willis notice two levels of union with Christ in Calvin; however, the levels they each notice are not identical. Tamburello points to the mystical and spiritual unions that we have treated above.⁷² Willis, in addition to mystical union, points to a union with Christ by virtue of the incarnation.⁷³ As I will show, each of these scholars has correctly described different portions of Calvin's

⁶⁹Calvin to Martyr, 351 [CO 15:723-724].

⁷⁰This distinction between Christ's offices of king and prophet is also made in Calvin's other writings. See, for example, Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.15.1-2 (494-496) [CO 2:361-363] and II.15.3-5 (496-501) [CO 2:363-366]. While Jansen discounts the use that Calvin makes of his triplex munus, his conclusions have not gone unchallenged. Compare J. F. Jansen, Calvin's Doctrine of the Work of Christ (London: James Clarke, 1956), 97 with Muller, 31-33.

⁷¹The contrast between mystical and spiritual communion is also clearly shown in Institutes (1559) III.1.1-2 (537-539) [CO 2:393-395]. Here Calvin first treats the Holy Spirit as the bond that unites believers to Christ (which is an obvious prologue to his later teaching on the unio mystica) and then moves to discuss the benefits of Christ the Mediator giving the Holy Spirit.

⁷²Tamburello, 86-87. Tamburello does develop these categories more fully, citing references quite widely in Calvin's corpus. He does not, however, display any awareness of Peter Martyr's 8 March 1555 letter to Calvin nor use Martyr's teaching on the subject as background material for interpreting Calvin's views. The same is true of his academic supervisor. See B. A. Gerrish, Grace and Gratitude, 128-129.

⁷³Willis-Watkins, 78-79. These categories are not developed more fully. Willis-Watkins only references Calvin's 1559 Institutes in this brief treatment.

overall position on union with Christ.

Incarnational Communion with Christ

It is no wonder that Tamburello misses Calvin's reference to incarnational communion in his letter to Peter Martyr on 8 August 1555. Without previous knowledge of Martyr's own letter on the subject, Calvin's reference to incarnational communion is easily overlooked.⁷⁴ After brief introductory remarks, Calvin plunges into the requested topic of correspondence only with some hesitation:

Although I promised to write to you, on the secret Communion which we have with Christ, yet I shall not treat this subject so largely as you hoped: nevertheless, as the matter is one of vast importance, I think it may be profitable to state my opinion definitely in a few words.⁷⁵

In the next sentence the Genevan makes his fleeting comments about incarnational communion:

That the Son of God put on our flesh, in order that He might become our Brother, partaker of the same nature,--is a Communion on which I do not mean to speak here: for I propose to treat only [mystic and spiritual communion].⁷⁶

⁷⁴In fairness, incarnational union does fall outside the scope of Tamburello's comparative study on mystical union in Calvin and Bernard. He does, however, only denominate two degrees of union with Christ when treating this material. His academic supervisor is perhaps more observant, when he describes mystical communion as "something subsequent to the union with Christ that was already effected by the incarnation, but antecedent to the communication of his benefits" (Gerrish, 128). He does not expand upon this theme.

⁷⁵Calvin to Martyr, 349 [CO 15:722]. Calvin's promise of brevity may be made more out of courtesy than consequence. After his generous treatment, Calvin concludes: "Were I teaching any other person, I should follow up this subject more diffusely; in addressing you, I have glanced at it briefly, with the simple view of showing you that we entirely agree in sentiment." Calvin to Martyr, 352 [CO 15:724].

⁷⁶Calvin to Martyr, 349. The Latin reads: "Quod filius Dei carnem nostram induit, ut frater noster fieret eiusdem naturae particeps, de illa communicatione dicere supersedeo" (CO 15:722). Gerrish notes that later in this same letter, when referring

Calvin then begins his treatment of mystic communion, followed by instruction on spiritual communion.

With this passing reference, Calvin is acknowledging Martyr's fuller treatment of incarnational communion with Christ in his letter of 8 March 1555. While he obviously means what he says--he does not mean to expand on this kind of communion with Christ in this letter--Calvin does not leave us empty-handed. The very terms in which he avoids the subject give us a handle with which to grasp his meaning in other places: "carnem nostram induit, ut frater noster fieret eiusdem naturae particeps." Calvin's preferred terminology for this relationship, like Martyr's, is not incarnational "union" but "communion."⁷⁷ Calvin feels it sufficient to point out that an incarnational communion exists and to indicate that fact with a certain idiom.

Martyr's original request to Calvin was both polite and compelling:

I have discussed this matter more at large, I fear, than suits your occupation, and yet less copiously than may suffice to unfold my meaning. When you shall have leisure, do not, I pray, conceal from me any part of your opinion.⁷⁸

to spiritual union, Calvin varies the terms communio and communicatio without any difference in meaning (see Gerrish, Grace and Gratitude, 129, n. 16). In this earlier instance, however, Calvin's use of communicatio when discussing the incarnation carries a more definite overtone--that of the communicatio idiomatum. Calvin's Reformed construction of this doctrine conflicted with that of his Lutheran counterparts who taught the ubiquity of Christ's body.

⁷⁷In the letters between them, the relationship between Christ and human persons based on the incarnation alone is not called a unio. For Martyr's use of both communio and communicatio when discussing natural communion in neighboring sentences, see LC 768. Calvin only uses communicatio for this relation; see footnote 110 above. Could Martyr and Calvin be signalling a qualitative difference in this use of "communion" or "communication" rather than "union"? Did unio carry heavy ontological overtones that could too easily be confused with a mixture of essence when referring to this relationship?

⁷⁸Martyr to Calvin, 344.

Calvin in turn professes in the strongest terms consistency and continuity with Martyr's own position on the doctrine of union with Christ as stated in his letter:

Were I teaching any other person, I should follow up this subject more diffusely; in addressing you, I have glanced at it briefly, with the simple view of shewing you that we entirely agree in sentiment.⁷⁹

There is no hint of duplicity in Calvin's dealings with Martyr here. Calvin is comfortable passing over incarnational communion when answering Peter Martyr's plea for his own frank opinion on the doctrine of union with Christ. Martyr and Calvin were very close in their mutual theology, friendship, and regard at this point in their lives.⁸⁰ Thus, it is patently unreasonable to suspect that in passing over incarnational communion Calvin had something to hide.⁸¹ In disregarding the topic, is Calvin not implying that the wider subject can be adequately treated without it?

Calvin's important correspondence with Peter Martyr highlights several key points about his doctrine of incarnational communion with Christ. First, Calvin is happy professing to "entirely agree in sentiment" with someone who describes incarnational "communion" as *debilis* and reserves Johannine ingrafting language for believers only. This same person explicitly points to a biological origin for this

⁷⁹Calvin to Martyr, 352. CO 15:724: "Apud alium quempiam, qui mihi docendus esset, fusius prosequer quae breviter apud te hoc tantum consilio perstringo, ut nos idem prorsus sentire videas."

⁸⁰Calvin had just offered Martyr a job in Geneva, and Martyr had only a few months before given Calvin some quite frank advice that Calvin warmly appreciated (see Calvin, Tracts and Letters, vol. 6, 121-126) [CO 15:386-389]. Calvin continued to have a warm and open relationship with Martyr. See Calvin, Tracts and Letters, vol. 6, 313-314 [CO 16:403-404].

⁸¹Even McLelland insists that Calvin is here professing continuity with Martyr's views on incarnational union, although McLelland inflates the place of incarnational union in Martyr's theology. McClelland [sic], 271, n. 3.

communion in men and women, rather than to an upholding of the cosmos or human flesh by the incarnate Saviour. Finally, Calvin can contentedly pass over the whole subject of incarnational communion when discussing the believer's union with Christ. In our effort to probe Calvin's fuller views on incarnational communion, we must therefore look to his wider corpus for light, using the handle he gives in this letter to grasp the subject more firmly.

Calvin on Incarnational Communion

What lies behind John Calvin's brief allusion to Vermigli that there is a communion based on the fact that "the Son of God put on our flesh, in order that He might become our Brother, partaker of the same nature"? Does the nature of this relation in Calvin's theology support Torrance's claim that all men are ingrafted into Christ by virtue of the incarnation?

In order to facilitate the evaluation of Calvin's teaching on incarnational communion with Christ, a selective perusal of Calvin's opera has been made, in addition to a study of the secondary literature.⁸² Calvin's descriptive handle for incarnational communion given in his letter to Martyr also has been reduced into more manageable bits. Portions of each of the three phrases that make it up have been

⁸²In addition to the 1536 and 1559 editions of the Institutes of the Christian Religion, Calvin's biblical commentaries on the Synoptic Gospels, the Gospel of John, Romans, Hebrews, James, First John, and Jude were included in the study. Other selected texts closely related to the incarnation and union with Christ were also examined in Calvin's commentaries and sermons, such as in the Psalms and Ephesians. The criteria on which these selections were based included both the promise of the material to be germane to the dogma and use by Torrance in his own writings.

considered separately, in addition to the key words "flesh," "brother," and "nature."⁸³

The fruit of this study will be outlined below, with particular attention paid to the nature of the relation as envisioned by Calvin. Calvin's understanding of Christ's conception will then be examined for any insights that it might hold for incarnational communion. Finally, we will survey the conclusions of secondary literature on the topic.

Calvin's Selected Works

The three key words and phrases Calvin uses to identify incarnational communion with Christ in his 8 August 1555 letter to Peter Martyr are closely connected in Calvin's mind. Often the key terms appear in the same sections of his biblical commentaries.⁸⁴ One of Calvin's passages is even strikingly similar to that written to Martyr.⁸⁵ These phrases are not, however, simply synonyms for each other.

⁸³Passages identified as germane to our topic by a thorough reading in the selected biblical commentaries were entered into a computer text file. Word searches were then performed for over 30 key terms and phrases. The three phrases and key words used by Calvin in his designation of incarnational union to Peter Martyr were included in these searches. Sections from the two editions of the Institutes were not included in the computer text files since Tamburello's study covers much of this ground and the material in question is more dogmatically arranged. Since there are limitations to mere computerized word and phrase studies for identifying a person's thought, this fuller methodology was chosen. In the material selected, not only were key terms identified and catalogued, but the full text was read as well, watching for related terms, themes, and concepts that might be overlooked due to Calvin's richness of language.

⁸⁴Occurrences of any two of these three words are too numerous to mention. All three key words--"flesh," "brother," and "nature"--occur in Calvin's comments on Luke 1:35, Luke 2:40, John 3:13, Hebrews 2:16-17, Hebrews 4:15, Hebrews 5:3, and I John 4:2.

⁸⁵John Calvin, The Gospel According to John 11-21 and the First Epistle of John, ed. D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance, trans. T. H. L. Parker (Edinburgh: St. Andrew Press, 1961), 286 (I Jn. 4:2) [CO 55:349]: "By saying that He came in the flesh, he

Each has its own particular set of emphases.

The first phrase John Calvin uses is filius Dei carnem nostram induit. In the biblical commentaries surveyed, a total of fourteen occurrences of the phrase "put on our flesh" were found in five different commentaries.⁸⁶ It appears to stress the event of the incarnation itself, sometimes with a particular accent upon the corporal body of Jesus. Calvin marks the occasion of the first coming of the Son of God into our world with this important phrase.⁸⁷ He also stresses that Christ not only "put on our flesh" but also had human feelings, as if to balance a more corporal concept with a more affective one.⁸⁸ Calvin says once that Christ's human nature includes "the essence of

means that by putting on flesh, He became a real man, of the same nature with us, that He became our brother--except that He was free from all sin and corruption."

⁸⁶Calvin uses this phrase three times in his comments on Hebrews 2:10-14, in addition to once in Hebrews 9:11. The phrase occurs twice in comments on I John 1:1-2. Other occurrences are more scattered in his two commentaries on the four Gospels.

⁸⁷John Calvin, A Harmony of the Gospels Matthew, Mark and Luke, vol. 1, ed. D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance, trans. A. W. Morrison (Edinburgh: St. Andrew Press, 1972), 264 (Mt. 9:12) [CO 45:250]: "If we consider that this was His mission, this was the object of His coming, if we take to heart that for this reason He put on flesh, shed His own blood, fulfilled the sacrifice of death, went down to the depths beneath, it will never seem to us out of place that He draws into the embrace of salvation the very dregs of humanity, people entirely swamped in the morass of crime." See also John Calvin, A Harmony of the Gospels Matthew, Mark and Luke, vol. 3, ed. D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance, trans. A. W. Morrison (Edinburgh: St. Andrew Press, 1972), 99 (Mt. 24:36); John Calvin, The Gospel According to John 1-10, ed. D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance, trans. T. H. L. Parker (Edinburgh: St. Andrew Press, 1959), 72 (Jn. 3:13); Calvin, John 11-21, 69 (Jn. 13:33) and 235 (I Jn. 1:2); John Calvin, The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews and the First and Second Epistles of St. Peter, ed. D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance, trans. W. B. Johnston (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 1963), 25,26,30 (Heb. 2:10,11,14).

⁸⁸Calvin, John 11-21, 12 (Jn. 11:33) [CO 47:265]: ". . . when the Son of God put on flesh He also of His own accord put on human feelings, so that he differed in nothing from His brethren, sin only excepted." See also Calvin, Harmony of the

the flesh," clearly indicating Christ's corporal body, although all other occurrences of the term "essence" were restricted to Christ's divinity.⁸⁹ The word "flesh" occurs over 100 times in sections of the material surveyed in which Calvin's comments are germane to our topic.

The second phrase in Calvin's shorthand to Martyr for incarnational communion is "frater noster fieret." The simple phrase "our brother" when applied to Christ occurs ten times in the relevant sections of the commentaries surveyed.⁹⁰ With it Calvin stresses the kinship and equality between the incarnate Christ and his fellow human beings by virtue of his sheer humanity.⁹¹ The phrase can also apply in a very

Gospels, vol. 1, 244 (Mt. 8:3) [CO 45:231-232]; Calvin, John 11-21, 234,235 (I Jn. 1:1,2) [CO 55:299-302]; Calvin, Hebrews, 120 (Heb. 9:11) [CO 55:109-110]. Calvin's understanding of Christ's body is decidedly physical and spatial, which is made quite plain in his treatment of post-resurrection events. See Institutes (1559) IV.17.29 (1398-1401) [CO 2:1028-1030].

⁸⁹Calvin, Hebrews, 32-33 (Heb. 2:17) [CO 55:34]: "In the human nature of Christ there are two things to be considered, the essence of the flesh and the affections. Therefore the apostle teaches that he put on not only human flesh itself, but also all the affections which belong to men."

⁹⁰Half of these occurred in the commentary on Hebrews, three in the commentary on the Synoptic Gospels, and two in the Gospel of John.

⁹¹Calvin, Harmony of the Gospels, vol. 1, 28-29 (Lk. 1:35) [CO 45:31]: "This quite rightly increases our confidence, to dare to invoke God as Father with more freedom, because His only Son put Himself on equal terms with us, wishing to be our brother." Calvin, Hebrews, 32 (Heb. 2:16) [CO 55:34]: "... in the person of the Son of God we have found a Brother because of the fellowship of our common nature. He is therefore not content just to call Him a Man, but says that He is born of human seed." Calvin, Harmony of the Gospels, vol. 1, 107 (Lk. 2:40) [CO 45:104]: "... Christ, in truth and in reality, when He put on our flesh, embraced the full role of brotherly union with men. We must not imagine He was two-faced about this: though He was one Person of God and man, it does not follow that His human nature was given anything that was properly divine"

selective way to Christians only.⁹² The word "brother," its plural, and its cognates are found over twenty-five times in the sections surveyed. The theme of Christ as our brother appears to be the focal point of Calvin's description to Peter Martyr of incarnational communion, since it is preceded by the final subordinate conjunction ut. Thus, it will be treated in more detail below.

The third phrase in Calvin's letter is eiusdem naturae particeps. The simpler construction "the same nature" occurs only six times in the material surveyed, whereas the key word "nature" appears over 135 times.⁹³ This is the most metaphysical phrase in Calvin's designation of incarnational communion, used to specify a particular category of being in a larger cosmological architecture.⁹⁴ Possession of a real human

⁹²John Calvin, A Harmony of the Gospels Matthew, Mark and Luke, vol. 2, ed. D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance, trans. T. H. L. Parker (Edinburgh: St. Andrew Press, 1972), 56 (Mt. 12:48): "He receives all His disciples and believers into the same rank of honour as if they were His closest relatives; more, He substitutes them for His mother and brothers. But this statement is based on Christ's office; for it means that he was given, not just to a few but to all the godly, who by faith compose with Him one body. . . . Christ gives the disciples of His Gospel the incomparable honour of regarding them as His brothers" Calvin, John 1-10, 182 (Jn. 7:5) [CO 47:166]: "Therefore whoever would be reckoned to be in Christ, as Paul says, let him be a new creature (II Cor. 5.17; Gal. 6.15); for those who give themselves entirely to God are placed in the position of father and mother and brethren to Christ, but others He utterly disavows." See also Calvin, Hebrews, 35 (Heb. 3:2) [CO 55:36]; Calvin, Harmony of the Gospels, vol. 2, 295 (Lk. 19:41) [CO 45:575-576].

⁹³The phrase appears three times in the commentary on Hebrews and once each in the commentaries on the Gospel of John, Colossians, and I John.

⁹⁴Calvin, Hebrews, 58-59 (Heb. 5:1) [CO 55:57]: "The fact that the Son of God has a common nature with us does not detract from His dignity, but rather commends Him the more to us. He is fitted to reconcile God to us because He is Man. In order to prove that He is our Mediator Paul expressly calls Him Man, since if He had been chosen from among the angels or from anywhere else, we could not have been united with God through Him because He would not reach down to us." See also Calvin, Hebrews, 7 (Heb. 1:2) [CO 55:10-11] and 30-31 (Heb. 2:14) [CO 55:32-33]; Calvin, John 11-21, 140 (Jn. 17:9) [CO 47:380-381].

body appears to be the prime indication to Calvin of the metaphysical category of human.⁹⁵ The words "partake" and "participate," which can both translate the Latin word particeps, are used of Christ in the biblical commentaries surveyed once, and then merely to deny the Arian doctrine that Christ was God by participation only.⁹⁶

When treating the phrase frater noster fieret above, two distinct moments of Calvin's usage for the simpler phrase "our brother" were noted--one applicable to all human beings, one particular to believers only. This theme of Christ as our brother now deserves greater attention, especially because Calvin marks it with the subordinate conjunction ut, indicating that it is the focal point of incarnational communion.

In his Institutes and biblical commentaries, Calvin does point to a natural brotherhood that unites all men. When commenting on the Parable of the Good Samaritan, Calvin says that "the whole human race is linked in a holy bond of

⁹⁵For example, John Calvin, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians, ed. D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance, trans. T. H. L. Parker (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1965), 314-315 (Col. 1:22): "He meant, therefore, to express that the Son of God had put on the same nature with us, that He took upon Him this lowly and earthly body, subject to many infirmities, that He might be our Mediator." Calvin's understanding of Christ's human nature can pivot on His having a physical and spatial body. Institutes (1559) IV.17.29 (1398-1399) [CO 2:1029]: "But if to fill all things in an invisible manner is numbered among the gifts of the glorified body, it is plain that the substance of the body is wiped out, and that no difference between deity and human nature is left."

⁹⁶Calvin, John 11-21, 84 (Jn. 14:20) [CO 47:331]. The balance of the 32 occurrences of these terms refer to the believer participating or partaking in the blessings of God through Christ and the Spirit. The term "share" only occurs three times with reference to Christ: twice concerning his human emotions and once concerning his sharing of our nature. See Calvin, Harmony of the Gospels, vol. 1, 142 (Mt. 4:8) [CO 45:135-136]; Calvin, John 11-21, 12 (Jn. 11:33) [CO 47:264-265]; Calvin, Hebrews, 30 (Heb. 2:14) [CO 55:32-33].

brotherhood."⁹⁷ We cannot deny our common nature and the obligations it brings, for "man is created for man."⁹⁸ He repeats this theme when treating the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats in Matthew 25. Acknowledging that there is a "cord of common society between all of Adam's children," this fellowship carries with it a certain degree of ethical obligation that we owe to all men.⁹⁹

Into this sea of humanity with its mutual obligations and connections the Son of God came.¹⁰⁰ By putting on flesh, the Son of God "became our brother--except that He was free from all sin and corruption."¹⁰¹ Christ was thus

⁹⁷Calvin, Harmony of the Gospels, vol. 3, 37-38 (Lk. 10:30). CO 45:613 (Lk. 10:30): "Poterat simpliciter docere Christus, *proximi* nomen ad quemvis hominum promiscue extendi, quia totum humanum genus sancto quodam societatis vinculo coniunctum sit."

⁹⁸Calvin, Harmony of the Gospels, vol. 3, 38-39 (Lk. 10:30). CO 45:613 (Lk. 10:30): "Ergo ut quis nobis sit propinquus, sufficit esse hominem, quia nostrum non est communem naturam delere." CO 45:614 (Lk. 10:30): "Et misericordia, quam Iudaeo hostis praestitit, demonstrat natura duce et magistra, hominem hominis causa esse creatum: unde colligitur mutua inter omnes obligatio." See also Calvin, Institutes (1559) III.20.38 (901) [CO 2:663-664]; and John Calvin, Sermons on the Epistle to the Ephesians, trans. Arthur Golding, rev. ed. (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1973), 565 and 593.

⁹⁹CO 45:689 (Mt. 25:40): ". . . commune est societatis vinculum inter omnes filios Adam" Ethical obligation is also highlighted on this basis in CO 45:251 (Mt. 9:13): "Sic tamen habendum est, fidem et spiritualem cultum per se Deo placere, caritatem et humanitatis officia erga proximos per se requiri" This is not to say that a mutual ethical obligation is all that human beings share. Calvin, however, specifically highlights this aspect of common human brotherhood. There may be, and doubtless are, many other facets to our human brotherhood.

¹⁰⁰Since the complexity of the human brotherhood must not be underestimated, we will engage in a comparative analysis. Human nature--and consequently the bond of human brotherhood--is not something Calvin so much defines as assumes and uses. He doubtless regards it as something his readers know and experience. In keeping with his own method, we will trace how Calvin relates different categories of persons to the incarnate Christ and to each other.

¹⁰¹Calvin, John 11-21, 286 (I Jn. 4:2) [CO 55:348-349].

a partaker of the same nature with us, and joined to us by a true fellowship of the flesh, seeing that he acknowledges us as his brethren, and vouchsafes to give us a title so honourable.¹⁰²

He did not shrink back from this natural relationship or "true fellowship of the flesh" but "embraced the full role of brotherly union with men."¹⁰³ Thus, to all men, Christ stretched out "a brotherly hand" in the incarnation.¹⁰⁴

By calling us "brothers," Christ confirms "the right of fraternal alliance" with

¹⁰²John Calvin, Commentary on the Book of Psalms, vol. 1, trans. J. Anderson, Calvin Commentary Series, vol. 4 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1989), 379 (Ps. 22:22). CO 31:231 (Ps. 22:23): ". . . colligit eiusdem nobiscum naturae fuisse participem nobisque vera carnis societate fuisse coniunctum, quos pro fratribus agnoscit, tamque honorifico nomine dignatur." The phrase "fellowship of the flesh" or carnis societate may best be understood in light of Calvin's statements in Institutes (1559) II.12.2 (465) [CO 2:341]: ". . . God's natural Son fashioned for himself a body from our body, flesh from our flesh, bones from our bones, that he might be one with us. . . . [h]ence that holy brotherhood"

¹⁰³Calvin, Harmony of the Gospels, vol. 1, 107 (Lk. 2:40): "There is no doubt that God's purpose was to make entirely explicit that Christ, in truth and in reality, when He put on our flesh, embraced the full role of brotherly union with men. We must not imagine he was two-faced about this: though He was one Person of God and man, it does not follow that His human nature was given anything that was properly divine" CO 45:104 (Lk. 2:40): "Nec vero dubium est, quin Dei consilium fuerit diserte exprimere, quam vere et solide Christus, quum induit carnem nostram, omnes fraternae cum hominibus coniunctionis partes sit amplexus. Neque hoc modo duplicem ipsum fingimus: nam etsi una fuit *Dei* et *hominis* persona, non sequitur tamen, humanae naturae fuisse datum quidquid proprium divinitatis erat"

¹⁰⁴Calvin, John 1-10, 72 (Jn. 3:13): "Hence Christ, who is in heaven, put on our flesh that, by stretching out a brotherly hand to us, He might raise us to heaven along with Himself." CO 47:62 (Jn. 3:13): "Christus ergo quid in coelo est carnem nostram induit, ut porrecta nobis fraterna manu secum nos ad coelum evehat." Also, John Calvin, The Second Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians and the Epistles to Timothy, Titus and Philemon, ed. D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance, trans. T. A. Smail (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964), 210 (I Tim. 2:5) [CO 52:270]: "And if it were deeply impressed on the hearts of all men that the Son of God holds out to us the hand of a brother and is joined to us by sharing our nature, who would not choose to walk in this straight highway rather than wander in uncertain and rough byways?" See also Calvin, Hebrews, 364 (II Peter 3:9) [CO 55:475-476].

Him, a right that extends to some degree to all human beings in general.¹⁰⁵ Not all enjoy this right, however, since unbelievers "break off and dissolve that relationship of the flesh," making themselves "utter strangers" to Christ.¹⁰⁶ Therefore, Christ "retains in the degree of brethren none but true believers," although he displays himself to them all as a brother.¹⁰⁷ Thus, Christ publicly holds out a brotherly hand to all men, offering

¹⁰⁵Calvin, Psalms, vol. 1, 379 (Ps. 22:22): "The apostle, therefore, justly deduces from this, that under and by the name *brethren*, the right of fraternal alliance with Christ has been confirmed to us. This no doubt, to a certain extent, belongs to all mankind" CO 31:231 (Ps. 22:23): ". . . scite ergo apostolus et prudenter observat, sub hoc nomine sancitum nobis fuisse cum Christo ius fraternae coniunctionis. Etsi autem competit hoc aliquatenus in totum genus humanum" See also Calvin, Sermons on Ephesians, 124, 573, 576, 602; Calvin, Galatians, 313 (Col. 1:20) [CO 12:88-89]; Calvin, Tracts, 2:507 [CO 9:470]; John Calvin, Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Isaiah, trans. William Pringle, 4 vols. (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society; reprint ed., Calvin's Commentaries, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1989), 4:13.

¹⁰⁶Calvin, Psalms, vol. 1, 379 (Ps. 22:22): "This no doubt, to a certain extent, belongs to all mankind, but the true enjoyment thereof belongs properly to genuine believers alone. For this reason Christ himself, with his own mouth, limits this title to his disciples. . . . The ungodly, by means of their unbelief, break off and dissolve that relationship of the flesh, by which he has allied himself to us, and thus render themselves utter strangers to him by their own fault." CO 31:231-2 (Ps. 22:23): "Etsi autem competit hoc aliquatenus in totum genus humanum, vera tamen fruitio penes fideles solos residet. Qua ratione etiam Christus ore suo titulum hunc restringit ad discipulos Illam enim carnis cognationem, qua nos sibi sociavit, impii dissidio incredulitatis suae abrumpunt, ut sua culpa alieni prorsus reddantur." Note the severity of Calvin's tone against unbelievers, when positing the termination of this natural relation. T. F. Torrance quoted this portion of Calvin's commentary on Psalm 22 when claiming that Calvin taught a universal ingrafting into Christ by virtue of the incarnation. The difference in verse citation given by Torrance is due to the Latin text. See footnote 8 above.

¹⁰⁷Calvin, Psalms, vol. 1, 379 (Ps. 22:22): "As David, while he comprehended under the word *brethren* all the offspring of Abraham, immediately after (verse 23) particularly addresses his discourse to the true worshippers of God; so Christ, while he has broken down 'the middle wall of partition' between Jews and Gentiles, and published the blessings of adoption to all nations, and thereby exhibited himself to them as a brother, retains in the degree of brethren none but true believers." CO 31:232 (Ps. 22:23): "Quemadmodum enim David totum Abrahae genus hac voce complexus

himself to them as a brother, but true fraternal alliance only applies to those who accept his offer. The others in rejecting this legal right are strangers to Him.

This theme of limited brotherhood is repeated by Calvin when responding to criticism from Menno Simons.¹⁰⁸ Calvin opposed his form of docetism, insisting that Christ was truly human, enjoying the bond of human brotherhood with men.¹⁰⁹ But does not Calvin's christology imply the indiscriminate brotherhood of Christ, so that even the ungodly are Christ's brothers? Calvin retorts:

Moreover, baseless is their objection that in this way the impious would be Christ's brethren. For we know that the children of God are not born of flesh and blood [cf. John 1:13] but of the Spirit through faith. Hence flesh alone does not make the bond of brotherhood. Even though the apostle assigns to believers alone the honor of being one with Christ, it does not follow that unbelievers cannot be born of the same source [according to the flesh]. For example, when we say that Christ was made man that he might make us children of God, this expression does not extend to all men. For faith intervenes, to engraft us spiritually into the body of Christ.¹¹⁰

sermonem continuo post ad veros Dei cultores specialiter dirigit: ita Christus qui diruta maceria cunctis gentibus adoptionem publicaverat, seque hoc modo obtulerat in fratrem, non alios quam fideles in gradu fratrum retinet."

¹⁰⁸See Institutes (1559) II.13.1 (474, n. 2). On Menno Simons (1496-1561) and Calvin, see G. H. Williams, The Radical Reformation (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962), 487-488.

¹⁰⁹Menno Simons taught that Christ's flesh was not of Mary but directly of celestial origin (Williams, 325-332). See also T. George, Theology of the Reformers (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1988), 282-283. Calvin taught otherwise. Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.13.2 (477) [CO 2:349-350]: "Christ's true humanity is expressed by this figure. For even though he was not immediately begotten of a mortal father, his origin derived from Adam In these words Christ is clearly declared to be comrade and partner in the same nature with us The context shows that this expression refers to the fellowship of nature" The Scripture passage Calvin is here discussing is Hebrews 2:11.

¹¹⁰Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.13.2 (477-478). CO 2:350 (Inst. II.13.2): "Frustra autem obiectant, impios hoc modo fore Christi fratres; qui scimus filios Dei non ex carne et sanguine, sed ex spiritu nasci per fidem. Proinde fraternam coniunctionem

Calvin's rebuttal of Menno Simons' charge is repeated in an undated and unaddressed letter that goes into more detail. In a parallel to the Institutes passage above, Calvin concludes:

We know that the sons of God are born not of flesh and blood but of the Spirit through faith. The sharing of flesh alone does not produce brotherly communion.¹¹¹

Calvin's language of "brotherly communion" or fraternam communicationem bluntly shows the relevance of these passages.

Thus, Calvin draws a clear distinction between Christ's relationship with unbelievers and with believers. Christ's relationship with unbelievers is greatly minimized by the Reformer. The impious only share a common origin with Christ--both have been born according to the flesh. They do not, however, really possess "the bond of brotherhood" with Christ because more than a connection in flesh is required to be ingrafted into Christ. Only genuine believers, born of the flesh and the spirit, share "the bond of brotherhood" with Christ.¹¹² What is offered indiscriminately is

non facit sola caro. Tametsi autem apostolus hunc honorem assignat solis fidelibus, quod ex uno sint cum Christo, non tamen sequitur quominus ex eodem fonte nascentur increduli secundum carnem. Quemadmodum ubi dicimus Christum factum esse hominem ut nos faceret Dei filios, non extenditur haec loquutio ad quoslibet; quia fides media interponitur, quae nos in Christi corpus spiritualiter inserit." N.B.: the phrase secundum carnem is omitted in Battles' English translation and has thus been inserted in brackets.

¹¹¹John Calvin, Calvin's Ecclesiastical Advice, trans. M. Beaty and B. W. Farley (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991), 39-40. CO 10:171 (Contra Mennonem): "Frustra autem obiectat Menno, impios alioqui fore Christi fratres: quia scimus filios Dei non ex carne et sanguine, sed ex spiritu nasci per fidem. Proinde fraternam communicationem non facit sola carnis societas."

¹¹²Calvin even says that Christ won for his people "the extreme honour of being recognized among the angels as their brothers," thus emphasizing the priority of the connection via the Spirit over that of the flesh. Calvin, Harmony of the Gospels, vol.

obtained and actually experienced only particularly.¹¹³ Those who spurn the true brotherhood held out to them by Christ only share the honor of having come into the world in the same way as Christ--according to the flesh.

This answer to Simons' objection is important because it informs the reader how to interpret Calvin's broader statements concerning the incarnation and the salvation of men. It is a mistake to deduce too broadly soteriological implications from Calvin's teaching on the incarnation:

For example, when we say that Christ was made man that he might make us children of God, this expression does not extend to all men. For faith intervenes, to engraft us spiritually into the body of Christ.¹¹⁴

This rule--from the 1539 edition of the Institutes--might well be considered a hermeneutical principle for Calvin interpretation and must especially be kept in mind when treating incarnational union. For example, Calvin's broader statements in Institutes II.12.2, which occur only a few paragraphs before this hermeneutical principle, should not be read to teach a universal brotherhood with Christ but to apply

3, 201 (Lk. 23:39) [CO 45:772]. See also Calvin, Sermons on Ephesians, 114; John Calvin, Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets, trans. John Owen, 5 vols. (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society; reprint ed., Calvin's Commentaries, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1989), 5:39 (Zech. 1:12) [CO 44:140-142].

¹¹³See also Institutes (1559) III.20.36 (899) [CO 2:662]: "He, while he is the true Son, has of himself been given us as a brother that what he has of his own by nature may become ours by benefit of adoption if we embrace this great blessing with sure faith." See also Calvin, Galatians, 313 (Col. 1:20) [CO 52:88-89]; and R. A. Muller, Christ and the Decree (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1986), 33-35.

¹¹⁴Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.13.2 (477-478). CO 2:350 (Inst. III.13.2): "Quemadmodum ubi dicimus Christum factum esse hominem ut nos faceret Dei filios, non extenditur haec loquutio ad quoslibet; quia fides media interponitur, quae nos in Christi corpus spiritualiter inserit."

only to believers.¹¹⁵

This unique brotherhood of Christ to Christians is emphasized by Calvin in his biblical commentaries. When commenting on John 7:5, the Genevan limits the phrases "in Christ" and "brethren to Christ" to genuine believers only. He then concludes:

Therefore whoever would be reckoned to be in Christ, as Paul says, let him be a new creature (II Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15); for those who give themselves entirely to God are placed in the position of father and mother and brethren to Christ, but others He utterly disavows.¹¹⁶

Thus, the "fruit and effect of that brotherly union . . . is expressed when Christ makes God the Father common to Himself and us."¹¹⁷

Like Menno Simons' charge that Christ is made by Calvin the brother of the ungodly, the objection could also be raised that in making Christ the brother of the pious, Calvin depreciates Christ's Lordship over the Church. In his commentary on

¹¹⁵Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.12.2 (465) [CO 2:341]: "Therefore, relying on this pledge, we trust that we are sons of God, for God's natural Son fashioned for himself a body from our body, flesh from our flesh, bones from our bones, that he might be one with us [Gen. 2:23-24, mediated through Eph. 5:29-31]. Ungrudgingly he took our nature upon himself to impart to us what was his, and to become both Son of God and Son of man in common with us. Hence that holy brotherhood which he commends with his own lips when he says: 'I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God' [John 20:17]. In this way we are assured of the inheritance of the Heavenly Kingdom"

¹¹⁶Calvin, John 1-10, 182 (Jn. 7:5). CO 47:166 (Jn. 7:5): "Ergo, ut ait Paulus, quisquis in Christo censerī optat, sit nova creatura (1. Cor. 5, 7; Galat. 6, 15): nam qui se totos Deo addicunt, patris et matris et fratrum locum apud Christum obtinent: alios a se prorsus abdicat." See also Calvin, Isaiah, 4:125 (Isaiah 53:10) [CO 36:262-264].

¹¹⁷Calvin, John 11-21, 200-201 (Jn. 20:17). CO 47:435 (Jn 20:17): "Iam vero illius fraternae coniunctionis, cuius nuper facta est mentio, fructus et effectus exprimitur, dum Christus Deum et patrem nobis communem secum facit." See also Calvin, Institutes (1559) III.20.21 (879) [CO 2:647]: "For he is not Father to them unless they recognize Christ to be their brother." This raises interesting questions about Calvin's doctrine of adoption.

Hebrews 3:2, Calvin addresses this criticism:

If anyone objects that Christ is also part of the building, because He is the Foundation, because He is our Brother, because He holds fellowship with us, or that He is not the Architect because He Himself was made by God, there is a ready answer, namely that our faith is so founded on Him that He nonetheless governs us: that He is our Brother in such a way that He is also our Lord: that He was so made by God as to His humanity that as eternal God He gives life to all things and restores all things by His Spirit.¹¹⁸

Note the parallel drawn between Christ's humanity and his being our brother on the one hand versus Christ's divinity and his being our Lord on the other. Here Calvin protects Christ's Lordship over men from the supposedly demeaning implications of his brotherhood with them by distinguishing between his human and divine natures. Thus, his divine nature, not his human nature, makes him different from other men.

One of the richest passages in which Calvin treats all three parts of carnem nostram induit, ut frater noster fieret eiusdem naturae particeps appears in his commentary on Hebrews 2:10-11.¹¹⁹ To this passage we will turn our attention.

¹¹⁸Calvin, Hebrews, 35 (Heb. 3:2). CO 55:37 (Heb. 3:3): "Si quis obiiciat, Christum quoque esse partem aedificii, quia fundamentum est, quia frater noster, quia societatem nobiscum habet: deinde non esse architectum, quia et ipse a Deo formatus sit: prompta est solutio, fidem nostram ita in eo fundatam esse, ut nihilominus nobis praesideat: sic esse fratrem nostrum, ut sit interea et dominus: sic formatum esse a Deo quatenus homo est, ut spiritu suo vivificet tamen omnia et instauret quatenus aeternus est Deus." N.B.: The difference in verse citations is due to a rather serious mistake in the Torrance edition of Calvin's Hebrews commentary. An entire paragraph of Calvin's Latin text was omitted, including the number "3" following the missing paragraph, which should mark the third verse of the Reformer's comments on Hebrews chapter 3. The missing paragraph is present, however, in John Owen's English translation. See John Calvin, Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews, trans. John Owen, Calvin's Commentaries Series, vol. 22 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1972), 78-79. NB: all further citations of Calvin's Commentary on Hebrews refer to the Torrance edition. See also Willis, 70.

¹¹⁹All three key words and all three key phrases appear in this section of commentary by Calvin. Also, here the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews quotes from Psalm 22, Calvin's comments on which are cited by Torrance in support of his

The phrase carnem nostram induit appears when Calvin comments on Hebrews 2:10. His concern is that Christ's person should not be discounted in the eyes of believers because of his kenosis:

The purpose here is to render Christ's humiliation as glorious to the godly. When He is said to put on our flesh, He seems to be classed with common humanity. The Cross humbles Him below all men. We must therefore beware lest Christ is made of less account because of His own accord He emptied Himself for our sake.¹²⁰

The Reformer's comments on the rest of the verse continue to demonstrate why Christ's incarnation was most fitting and proper, even though by it he is "classed with common humanity."

Reflecting on Hebrews 2:11, Calvin calls it "an outstanding example of the divine loving-kindness that He put on our flesh."¹²¹ Then he expands on this theme, with particular implications for incarnational communion:

He says 'are all of one', that is that the Author of our salvation and we who share in it are of one nature (as I understand it). This is generally understood as meaning of one Adam; but some apply it to God, and this is not unreasonable. I am inclined to think that the nature described is one and the same, and I take one as being in the neuter gender, as if he were saying that we

teaching of universal carnal union with Christ. See footnote 8 above. Calvin also interacts with this portion of Scripture when rebutting Menno Simons in Institutes (1559) II.13.1-2 (474-478) [CO 2:347-350].

¹²⁰Calvin, Hebrews, 25. CO 55:27 (Heb. 2:10): "Hic status est, ut Christi humiliationem apud pios gloriosam reddat. Nam quum induisse carnem nostram dicitur, videtur vulgo hominum aggregari. Crux autem infra omnes homines eum deicit. Ergo cavendum ne minor censeatur Christus, quia sponte se propter nos exinanivit: quod nunc agitur."

¹²¹Calvin, Hebrews, 26. CO 55:28 (Heb. 2:11): "Et interea docet singulare hoc esse specimen divinae bonitatis, quod carnem nostram induit."

are all made of one and the same stuff.¹²²

Calvin does not trace the unity of Christ and the sanctified back to God the Father. Instead, he thinks the author of the epistle is speaking metaphysically, finding this oneness in the sheer fact that both Christ and the sanctified were made from the massa of human nature.

Calvin's use of massa should not be understood to eliminate God the Father from the picture altogether. That God is creator and sustainer of human life is never in doubt in Calvin's mind. Instead, Calvin professes continuity with the interpretation that is "generally understood as meaning of one Adam." He closes this paragraph of commentary agreeing with this accepted interpretation.¹²³

By using the term massa, Calvin gives a physical metaphor for a metaphysical category, reminiscent of either a lump of dough from which individual items are baked or a lump of clay from which ceramic ware is made.¹²⁴ There is no indication that he or the author of the epistle really believes that such a massa actually exists, predating

¹²²Calvin, Hebrews, 26. CO 55:28 (Heb. 2:11): "Dicit ergo ex uno esse, hoc est, ex una natura (ut ego quidem interpretor) autorem sanctitatis, et nos qui sumus eius participes. Communiter intelligunt ex uno Adam: nonnulli ad Deum referunt, neque absurde. Sed ego potius eandem naturam designari existimo, et unum intelligo in neutro genere: ac si diceret ex una massa nos esse compositos."

¹²³Calvin, Hebrews, 26 (Heb. 2:11) [CO 55:28]: "Nevertheless I prefer to follow the meaning that is more generally accepted, where that is not disagreeable to reason."

¹²⁴P. G. W. Glare, ed., Oxford Latin Dictionary, vol. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 1082. Does Calvin also intend to bring Augustine's massa perditionis to his readers' minds with such a term? See, for example, Augustinus Hipponensis, "De gratia Christi et de peccato originali," Patrologiae Latinae (Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1878) 44: 402. See also Wendel, Calvin, 194-95; and John Murray, The Imputation of Adam's Sin (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1959), 17-18 and 27-29.

the birth of individual men and women, other than in Adam himself.¹²⁵ The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews--to Calvin's mind--is expressing the continuity of nature between Christ and the sanctified via Adam.

This metaphysical commonality of origin is no small comfort to the Christian believer. In pastoral application, Calvin says:

This is a strong support for our faith that we are united to the Son of God by a bond of necessity [sic] so tight that we may find in our nature the holiness which we need. It is not only that He sanctified us inasmuch as He is God, but the power of sanctification lies in our human nature, not because it has it of itself, but because God pours into our nature the whole fulness of holiness so that we may all draw from it.¹²⁶

The common conceptual origin of Christ and the sanctified is a link--a necessitudinis vinculo, or a bond of affinity--which is an encouragement to the faith of believers. The power of sanctification is thus not obtained from the eternal Son of God above, but below from "our human nature" into which God has poured it.

¹²⁵For example, Calvin, Calvin's Ecclesiastical Advice, 38 [CO 10:169]: "Luke expresses this even more strongly when he teaches that a common salvation was brought by Christ to the whole human race because Christ, the source of salvation, was descended from Adam, everyone's common father."

¹²⁶Calvin, Hebrews, 26. CO 55:28 (Heb. 2:11): "Hoc vero ad augendam nostram fiduciam non parum valet, nos cum filie Dei tam arcto necessitudinis vinculo cohaerere, ut sanctitatem, qua indigemus, reperire in natura nostra liceat. Neque enim tantum quatenus Deus est, nos sanctificat, sed humanae quoque naturae vis sanctificandi inest: non quod eam habeat a se ipsa, sed quod solidam plenitudinem sanctitatis in eam effudit Deus, ut inde hauriamus omnes." N.B.: W. B. Johnston's English translation of necessitudinis vinculo reads "a bond of necessity" and should rather read "bond of affinity," indicating kinship, not causal necessity. See Glare, 1165. See also John Calvin, The Sermons of M. Iohn Calvin Vpon the Fifth Booke of Moses called Deuteronomie, trans. Arthur Golding (London: Henry Middleton, 1583; reprint ed., Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1987), 336: "And the cause also why hee tooke our fleshe and nature vppon him, was to the ende it should be a holy and indissoluble bonde of the vnion wherein it behoueth vs to put the whole trust of our saluation." Note that this sermon was written only five days after Calvin wrote his letter to Martyr.

This power of sanctification does not appear to us in angelic nature. In previous comments on Hebrews 1 and 2, Calvin discusses at length angelic nature and Christ's relation to it.¹²⁷ The focus then shifts dramatically in this passage to Christ's relation to human nature and his having "put on our flesh." Calvin's "our" appears to indicate the metaphysical category of human, implying a likeness of kind between Christ and the sanctified. Rather than in superior angelic nature or only in the eternal Son of God considered above, this sanctifying power is located in "our human nature" below.

How did God pour this sanctifying power into "our nature"? Calvin points to Christ's own incarnate obedience:

It is not only that He sanctified us inasmuch as He is God, but the power of sanctification lies in our human nature, not because it has it of itself, but because God pours into our nature the whole fulness of holiness so that we may all draw from it. That is the meaning of the sentence (John 17.19), 'For their sakes I sanctified myself.' If any are sinful and unclean, the remedy is not far to seek, because it is offered to us in our flesh.¹²⁸

The Son of God "put on our flesh" and, as the incarnate Christ, sanctified himself. Rather than finding the power of sanctification in the eternal Son, it is brought to us in Christ incarnate. The remedy for our sanctification is not far away: it is not offered in the eternal God above but "in our flesh" below.

¹²⁷All of Calvin's comments on the texts from Hebrews 1:4 to Hebrews 2:9 touch on angels. See Calvin, Hebrews, 10-24 [CO 55:14-27].

¹²⁸Calvin, Hebrews, 26. CO 55:28 (Heb. 2:11): "Neque enim tantum quatenus Deus est, nos sanctificat, sed humanae quoque naturae vis sanctificandi inest: non quod eam habeat a se ipsa, sed quod solidam plenitudinem sanctitatis in eam effudit Deus, ut inde hauriamus omnes. Quod pertinet illa sententia: Ego propter eos sanctifico me ipsum (Iohan. 17, 19). Ergo si nos profani et immundi, non procul quaerendum est remedium quod nobis offertur in carne nostra." This is an obvious reference to Christ's active obedience.

But precisely where is "in our flesh"? This is a most important question, because we must know exactly where to turn to draw from it. Does Calvin locate this power of sanctification in the incarnate Christ alone, making his expression "in our flesh" equivalent to "in the incarnate Christ"? Or, does he locate this power "in our flesh" in the sense that God has already poured this power into every human being or into human nature in abstracto through the incarnation? In short, is more required to possess it or "draw from it" than merely being human?

In answering this question, we must first briefly digress and examine Calvin's doctrine of justification. Only in appreciating this fuller theological context will Calvin's comments on the elect's sanctification be clarified.

The role of Christ's human nature in our justification, a crucial dogmatic point for Calvin, was clearly brought to the fore in a later controversy on justification surrounding Andreas Osiander.¹²⁹ Calvin countered Osiander's doctrine of "essential righteousness" by saying that the righteousness that Christ has and imputes to his members in justification is not the essential divine righteousness of the Godhead. Rather, it is the human righteousness of the incarnate Saviour, "acquired for us by

¹²⁹Andreas Osiander (1498-1552) was Professor of Theology at Königsberg and a major Lutheran controversialist. In 1550 he opposed Melancthon's doctrine of imputation of Christ's righteousness, positing instead the giving and crass mixing of the essential divine righteousness of Christ with believers. The first edition of Calvin's Hebrews commentary was published in 1549, but revised along with the rest of his New Testament commentaries in 1556. See also Calvin, Tracts, 2:554 [CO 9:504-505]. Calvin's major response to Osiander did not occur until 1559 in his Institutes (1559) II.12.4-7 (467-474) [CO 2:342-347] and III.11.5-12 (729-743) [CO 2:536-545]. See Jaroslav Pelikan, The Christian Tradition, vol. 4: Reformation of Church and Dogma (1300-1700) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 151-152; Neisel, Theology of Calvin, 133-134; W. Krusche, Das Wirken des Heiligen Geistes nach Calvin (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957), 268-270; and footnote 92 above.

Christ's obedience and sacrificial death."¹³⁰ The risen incarnate Jesus of salvation history is in possession of acquired human righteousness that he won during "the whole course of His obedience."¹³¹

Thus, the "whole fulness of holiness" that he offers to us for our justification is his own incarnate human holiness and righteousness, rather than that of angels or deity alone.¹³² Hence, Calvin strongly stresses the role of Christ's flesh in our salvation. His incarnate holiness and righteousness can be properly imputed to us so that we might be justified only through the believer's mystical union with, or engrafting into, Christ.¹³³

When treating Romans 5:17, Calvin emphasizes the need for a step beyond the natural relation of human beings with the incarnate Christ. He notes two differences

¹³⁰Calvin, Institutes (1559) III.11.5 (730) [CO 2:536]. N.B.: This includes both Christ's active and passive obedience.

¹³¹Hence, Calvin could earlier say: "In short, from the time when he took on the form of a servant, he began to pay the price of liberation in order to redeem us." Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.16.5 (507) [CO 2:371]. See also Joseph N. Tylanda [sic], "The Controversy on Christ the Mediator: Calvin's Second Reply to Stancaro," Calvin Theological Journal 8 (1973):150. Note that the author's name is Tylanda and is misspelled in the article.

¹³²Bruce L. McCormack notes cogently when commenting on Calvin's treatment of Osiander: "Such a notion ought to put us on alert to the possible negative ramifications of speaking too unguardedly of the Logos as the Subject of our redemption. The Subject of our redemption is not the Logos *simplicitor*, but the Logos who assumed human flesh, i.e. the God-man in his divine-human unity." Bruce L. McCormack, "For Us and For Our Salvation: Incarnation and Atonement in the Reformed Tradition," Studies in Reformed Theology and History 1 (Spring 1993): 22.

¹³³Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.12.4-7 (467-474) [CO 2:342-347] and III.11.10 (736-737) [CO 2:540-541]. Calvin's only two uses of the term unio mystica are made in the context of his debate with Osiander. See footnote 138 above. The unio mystica protects justification from being a legal fiction, which the whole context of Calvin's debate with Osiander makes abundantly clear. Tamburello also correlates the unio mystica and justification. See footnotes 99 and 100 above.

between Adam and Christ. The first is that condemnation in Adam involves both imputation and infusion of sin, whereas to be accounted righteous in Christ involves only "free imputation of righteousness."¹³⁴ The Reformer then notes a second difference:

The second difference is that Christ's benefit does not come to all men in the manner in which Adam involved the whole race in condemnation. The reason for this is quite obvious. Since the curse, which we derive from Adam, is conveyed to us by nature, we need not be surprised that it includes the whole of mankind. In order, however, that we may participate in the grace of Christ, we must be ingrafted into Him by faith.¹³⁵

Thus, cursing in Adam comes by nature, since he is the root of our human nature, but blessing in Christ comes by faith. Calvin then concludes:

The mere fact of being a man, therefore, is enough to entail participation in the wretched inheritance of sin, for it wells in human flesh and blood. It is necessary, however, to be a believer in order to enjoy the righteousness of Christ, for we attain to fellowship (*consortium*) with Him by faith.¹³⁶

Therefore, participation in Christ's righteousness comes not by virtue of our manhood or the incarnation alone, but only through the more intimate bond of the believer's union with Christ.

¹³⁴John Calvin, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians, ed. D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance, trans. R. Mackenzie (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1960), 116-117 (Rom. 5:17) [CO 49:100].

¹³⁵Calvin, Romans, 117 (Rom. 5:17). CO 49:100 (Rom. 5:17): "Altera est, quod non ad omnes homines pervenit Christi beneficium, quemadmodum universum suum genus damnatione Adam involvit. Ac ratio quidem in promptu est: nam quum ista, quam ex Adam trahimus, maledictio in nos per naturam derivata sit: non mirum est si totam massam complectatur. At vero, ut in participationem gratiae Christi veniamus, in eum inseri nos per fidem oportet."

¹³⁶Calvin, Romans, 117 (Rom. 5:17). CO 49:100 (Rom. 5:17): "Ergo, ut misera peccati haereditate potiari, satis est esse hominem: residet enim in carne et sanguine. Ut Christi iustitia fruaris, fidelem esse necessarium est: quia fide acquiritur eius consortium."

This emphasis upon salvation in Christ's flesh and our need for mystical union with him is not just relevant to Calvin's doctrine of justification. It also applies to his doctrine of sanctification. Calvin countenances no separation of union with Christ and his righteousness for justification from acquisition of Christ's holiness for sanctification.¹³⁷ Sanctification is by more than just imputation.¹³⁸ Thus, mystical union not only grounds justification but sanctification as well. In this way, these observations on justification are also relevant when following Calvin's comments on Hebrews 2:11.

From this dogmatic vantage point it is easier to see the intimate theological connection between the incarnation and two of the communions discussed earlier--mystical and spiritual communion with Christ. Both presuppose the incarnation as a fact of history, which produces the perfect human righteousness and holiness to be

¹³⁷John Calvin, The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, ed. D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance, trans. J. W. Fraser (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1960), 46 (I Cor. 1:30) [CO 49:331]: "From this we also gather that we cannot be justified freely by faith alone, if we do not at the same time live in holiness. For those gifts of grace go together as if tied by an inseparable bond, so that if anyone tries to separate them, he is, in a sense, tearing Christ to pieces. Accordingly, let the man who aims at being justified by God's free goodness through Christ take note that this cannot possibly be done, unless at the same time he lays hold of Him for sanctification" See also Calvin, Sermons on Ephesians, 588.

¹³⁸In his comments on John 17:19, Calvin notes that the sanctification of the elect by Christ is by more than mere imputation (see Calvin, John 11-21, 146 [Jn. 17:19] [CO 47:380]). McCormack notes: "He [Calvin] did indeed believe that God does not merely impute Christ's righteousness to us but also makes us to 'feed upon' it (through baptism and the eucharist), thereby making us to be in actuality what he declares us to be by a judicial declaration" (McCormack, 28). To this list of ways to "feed upon" Christ should also be added preaching. See Gerrish, 129.

shared.¹³⁹ Yet the incarnation in and of itself does not produce the unio mystica.¹⁴⁰ As the unio mystica between the believer and Christ grounds justification, so it too brings spiritual communion in its train, which grounds sanctification. Mystical and spiritual communion are not part of the incarnation itself, but are the necessary means by which a believer enjoys the presence of the incarnate Christ and his benefits.

¹³⁹Post-incarnation there is an obvious chronological dependence. Before the incarnation there was an eschatological dependence: "We must also note that, when even the fathers wanted to behold God, they always turned their eyes to Christ. I do not only mean that they contemplated God in His eternal Word, but also that they stretched out single-mindedly and whole-heartedly towards the promised manifestation of Christ" (Calvin, John 1-10, 26 [Jn. 1:18] [CO 47:20]). On this same theme, see also Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.7-11 [CO 2:252-340]; Calvin, John 1-10, 235 (Jn. 8:58) [CO 47:216]; John Calvin, Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses Arranged in the form of a Harmony, 4 vols., trans. Charles William Bingham (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society; reprint ed., Calvin's Commentaries, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1989), 1:61; and Calvin, Tracts, 2:532 [CO 9:488]. Does this mean that the Holy Spirit overcomes time as well as space in the unio mystica? See E. David Willis, Calvin's Catholic Christology in Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought, vol. 2, ed. H. A. Oberman (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966), 69, n. 3, for discussion of the distinction between Christ's essence and efficacy in the Old Testament period. Similarly, Pannenberg notes: "... the event of the incarnation itself stands for Calvin under the heading of the office of mediator." W. Pannenberg, Jesus--God and Man (London: SCM Press, 1968), 222.

¹⁴⁰Calvin, Galatians, 208 (Eph. 5:29) [CO 51:225]: "This is a remarkable passage on the mystical communication which we have with Christ. . . . He says that *we are members of him, of his flesh, and of his bones*. First, this is no exaggeration, but the simple truth. Second, he does not simply mean that Christ partook of our nature, but wants to express something deeper καὶ ἐμφατικώτερον. He refers to Moses' words in Gen. 2.24. What does it mean then? As Eve was formed out of the substance of her husband Adam, and thus was a part of him, so, if we are to be the true members of Christ, we grow into one Body by the communication of His substance. In short, Paul describes our union to Christ" T. H. L. Parker's English translation inserts a break at verse 30 that is not in the Latin text, severing the flow between the first and second sentences above. Compare with CO 29:225. Also pertinent are Calvin's later comments: "Such is the union between us and Christ, that in a sense He pours Himself into us. For we are not bone of His bone, and flesh of His flesh, because, like ourselves, He is man, but because, by the power of His Spirit, He engrafts us into His Body, so that from Him we derive life." Calvin, Galatians, 209 (Eph. 5:31) [CO 51:226].

Osiander's teaching on "essential righteousness" also sparked a second controversy that engulfed Calvin some years later by way of Francesco Stancaro.¹⁴¹ Like Calvin and Melancthon, Stancaro opposed Osiander's teaching but only at the cost of diminishing Christ's deity. Calvin responded by affirming the eternality of Christ's mediatorship:

Thus we understand first that the name of Mediator applies to Christ not only because he took on flesh or because he took on the office of reconciling the human race with God. But already from the beginning of creation he was truly Mediator because he was always the Head of the Church and held primacy even over the angels and was the first-born of all creatures. (Eph. 1:2; Col. 1:15ff; Col. 2:10). Whence we conclude that he began to perform the office of Mediator not only after the fall of Adam but insofar as he is the Eternal Son of God, angels as well as men were joined to God in order that they might remain upright.¹⁴²

This theme of Christ's eternal headship is not unknown in Calvin's other writings, but here Calvin appears to extend his use of the term "Mediator" beyond its previous bounds.¹⁴³ Calvin's basic message is clear: the person of Christ is Mediator in both

¹⁴¹An Italian Unitarian, Francesco Stancaro (1501-1574) taught Hebrew for a short period in Königsberg and there struggled rather violently with Osiander. In response to Osiander, Stancaro contended that Christ was only a mediator with God in his human nature. For this position he erroneously claimed the support of Calvin, who was thus forced to reply. Leading Polish churchmen also sought Calvin's opinion on the matter. See Calvin, "To John Lusen," dated 9 June 1560, Tracts and Letters, vol. 7, 112-114 [CO 18:100-101]; Joseph Tylanda, "Christ the Mediator: Calvin versus Stancaro," Calvin Theological Journal 8 (1973): 5-16; and Tylanda [sic], "The Controversy on Christ the Mediator," 131-157, which gives full English translations of Calvin's two treatises against Stancaro.

¹⁴²CO 9:338, quoted and translated in Willis, 70. In Christ's eternal mediatorship, Calvin even went so far as to include his priestly function, positing the eternal priesthood of Christ. See Calvin, Tracts and Letters, vol. 7, 113.

¹⁴³This theme of the eternal Son's mediatorship and headship over angels and men is not unknown in Calvin's other writings, e.g., Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.12.4 (467) [CO 2:255-256]; Calvin, Galatians, 129-130 (Eph. 1:8-10) [CO 51:150-151] and 310-313 (Col. 1:17-20) [CO 52:86-89]; Calvin, Sermons on the Epistle to the Ephesians,

natures.

Thus, it is not to Christ's human nature in abstracto but to Christ's incarnate person we must turn for the human holiness and righteousness discussed in Hebrews 2:11. In emphasizing Christ's flesh, Calvin is not wishing to bury the personal unity of the God-man: his whole approach to christology is based upon it.¹⁴⁴ In contrast to the approaches of Chalcedon and some medieval scholasticism, Calvin stresses the person of the God-man and the office of mediator he takes up, rather than the human nature of

63-64 (Eph. 1:7-10) [CO 51:149-151]; John Calvin, Sermons of Maister Iohn Caluin, vpon the Booke of Iob, trans. Arthur Golding (London: Thomae Woodcocke, 1574), 81-82 (Job 4:12-19) [CO 33:197-210]; John Calvin, "Sermon on I Corinthians 11:2-3," in Men, Women, and Order in the Church, trans. Seth Skolnitsky (Dallas, TX: Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1992), 18-19 [CO 49:472-475]; John Calvin, Commentaries on the First Book of Moses called Genesis, 2 vols., trans. John King (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society; reprint ed., Calvin's Commentaries, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1989), 2:429 (Gen. 16:6) [CO 23:226-227]; Calvin, Harmony of Moses, 1:61; George Smeaton, Christ's Doctrine of the Atonement (1870; reprint ed., Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1991), 43. Calvin limits this eternal mediatorship and headship to angels and the elect, when he claims it does not apply to devils or the ungodly. See Calvin, Galatians, 313 (Col. 1:20) [CO 52:88-89]. For a cogent discussion of Calvin's uses of the term "Mediator" before and after the incarnation, see Willis, 67-71. Willis points to three periods in which Calvin uses the term (pre-Fall, post-incarnation, and inbetween) and two nuances of meaning (mediation as reconciliation and mediation as sustenance). On Christ's mediation as sustenance, Willis concludes: "When he uses mediation to refer to Christ's eternal sustaining of the order of the world, he applies the term in a new way to a function which the tradition held belonged to Christ but which the tradition did not usually describe as mediation." Willis, 71.

¹⁴⁴While the christology Calvin forges is consonant with the ancient Church's rejection of major heretics, he is more functional and historical than metaphysical, guided by Scripture and pastoral concerns rather than just the Fathers. Calvin begins Book II of the Institutes displaying man's need of a redeemer, sweeping through salvation history in the Old Testament until he reaches chapter 12, "Christ Had to Become Man in Order to Fulfill the Office of Mediator." When first answering the classic question--Cur Deus Homo?--Calvin the theologian is decidedly pastoral and subjective, almost Schleiermacherian! See Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.12.1 (464-5) [CO 2:340-341]. Hence, Pannenberg can note Calvin "interpreted the doctrine of the two natures itself through the mediator concept." Pannenberg, 124.

Christ as mediator:

Here we cannot excuse the error of the ancient writers who pay no attention to the person of the Mediator, obscure the real meaning of almost all the teaching one reads in the Gospel of John, and entangle themselves in many snares. Let this, then, be our key to right understanding: those things which apply to the office of the Mediator, are not spoken simply either of the divine nature or of the human.¹⁴⁵

Thus, in stressing that in Hebrews 2:10-11 sanctifying power and holiness are offered to us in Christ's flesh, Calvin is highlighting their human quality, while not losing sight of the fact that we must turn for them only to the person of the Mediator.¹⁴⁶

The major theme of Hebrews 2:11--salvation is available from below--also appears in Institutes IV.17.8, where Calvin presents a concise version of salvation history while treating the Eucharist. Calvin begins with the Johannine prologue:

First of all, we are taught from the Scriptures that Christ was from the beginning that life-giving Word of the Father [John 1:1], the spring and source

¹⁴⁵Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.14.3 (485) [CO 2:355]. See also Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.14.4 [CO 2:355], where Calvin also parallels "person" and "the office of the Mediator." Pannenberg concludes that Calvin found the basis of the praedicatio verbalis in "a real transfer of attributes of both natures to the person of the Mediator and to the mediating work or office he performed, but not in a direct exchange of attributes between the natures themselves" (Pannenberg, 299). He further asserts that Calvin's "emphatic reference of the communication of attributes to Christ's mediatorial office" distinguishes him from both Melancthon and the high Scholastic tradition, but finds precedent for this approach in the doctrinal letter of Leo I in 449 A.D. (Pannenberg, 299-300, n. 48). See also R. A. Muller, Christ and the Decree, 29-33; and Willis, 63-7. Willis notes: "For Calvin, the *communicatio idiomatum* is primarily a hermeneutical tool to keep in balance the varied Scriptural witness to the One Person; but it rests upon and presupposes the hypostatic union." Willis, 67.

¹⁴⁶"We have already shown why Paul in speaking of the mediator especially applies the name of man to him, i.e., with fear set aside, he invites and draws us to him. He does not enter into any subtle dispute about essence but he supplies matter for trust so that we should not hesitate to have recourse to him who is our brother." CO 9:356, translated by Tylanda [sic], 154.

of life, from which all things have always received their capacity to live.¹⁴⁷

Estranged by the Fall from the eternal Word, man "lost participation in life" and could see only death on every hand. Where can he find "life" and "hope of immortality"?

Calvin points to the manifestation of Christ in the flesh:

But when the Source of life begins to abide in our flesh, he no longer lies hidden far from us, but shows us that we are to partake of him. But he also quickens our very flesh in which he abides, that by partaking of him we may be fed unto immortality.¹⁴⁸

In order that we might not lose all hope, life was therefore publicly manifest "for our eyes to see and our hands to touch" at the incarnation.¹⁴⁹ Quoting from John 6:48-51,

Calvin surmises:

by coming down he poured that power upon the flesh which he took in order that from it participation in life might flow unto us.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁷Calvin, Institutes (1559) IV.17.8 (1368) [CO 2:1007].

¹⁴⁸Calvin, Institutes (1559) IV.17.8 (1368) [CO 2:1008].

¹⁴⁹Calvin, Institutes (1559) IV.17.8 (1368) [CO 2:1008]. Also, Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.12.1, 465 [CO 2:341]: "... the Spirit calls him 'man,' thus teaching us that he is near us, indeed touches us, since he is our flesh."

¹⁵⁰Calvin, Institutes (1559) IV.17.8 (1368). CO 2:1008 (Inst. IV.17.8): "... sed descendendo vim istam in carnem quam induit, diffudisse, ut inde ad nos vitae communicatio promanaret." This same theme is found in Calvin's important commentary on John 6: "Since this secret power of bestowing life of which He is speaking might be referred to His divine essence, He now comes to the second step and tells them that this life resides in His flesh so that it may be drawn from it. It is a wonderful purpose of God that He has set life before us in that flesh, where before there had been only material death. And thus He provides for our weakness, for He does not call us above the clouds to enjoy life, but exhibits it on earth just as if He were exalting us to the mysteries of His Kingdom" (Calvin, John 1-10, 167 [Jn. 6:51] [CO 47:152]). Calvin calls Christ's flesh "a channel to pour out to us the life which resides intrinsically, as they say, in his divinity. In this sense it is called life-giving, because it communicates to us a life that it borrows from elsewhere" (Calvin, John 1-10, 167 [Jn. 6:51] [CO 47:152]). When in polemic with Stancaró, however, Calvin is more precise in his theological formulation: "Nor is the name of God incompatible, as

How is this life from Christ's flesh imparted? How do we participate in his life?

Christ's flesh and blood are food, nourishing believers "unto eternal life." With

Eucharistic overtones, Calvin says:

It is therefore a special comfort to the godly that they now find life in their own flesh. For not only do they reach it by an easy approach, but they have it spontaneously presented and laid out before them. Let them but open the bosom of their heart to embrace its presence, and they will obtain it.¹⁵¹

A second step beyond the incarnation is therefore required to take possession of the life laid out before us in the flesh of Christ. We must embrace him with our hearts to obtain life.

Returning to the major passage at hand--Hebrews 2:10-11--Calvin ends his comments on the first half of Hebrews 2:11 with a note of conciliation towards other interpretations of the biblical text:

If anyone prefers to take this as referring to a spiritual unity which the godly have with the Son of God differently from that which men have commonly among each other, I do not object. Nevertheless I prefer to follow the meaning that is more generally accepted, where that is not disagreeable to reason.¹⁵²

Acknowledging that Hebrews 2:11 is understood by other fine commentators to refer

long as it is correctly applied to the whole person, because nothing is less reasonable than that life, which is only to be sought in God, reside in flesh." CO 9:351, translated in Tylanda [sic], 148.

¹⁵¹Calvin, Institutes (1559) IV.17.8 (1368-1369). CO 2:1008 (Inst. IV.17.8): "In hoc ergo sita piis eximia consolatio, quod vitam in propria carne nunc reperiunt. Sic enim non modo facili ad eam aditu penetrant, sed ultro sibi expositam et obviam habent. Cordis sinum tantum protendant quo praesentem amplexentur, et eam obtinebunt."

¹⁵²Calvin, Hebrews, 26 (Heb. 2:11). CO 55:28 (Heb. 2:11): "Si de unitate spirituali accipere quis malit, quae alia est piis cum filio Dei, quam sit hominibus vulgo inter se: non repugno. Libenter tamen sequor quod magis receptum est, ubi non est a ratione dissentaneum."

to the believer's spiritual (or perhaps even mystical) union with Christ, Calvin prefers another antecedent to the text. He has a different relation in mind, a previous one that "men have commonly among each other." Calvin stresses that the common origin of Christ and the sanctified is simply native to being human. Any two humans share this relation, even Christ and the godly.

Calvin's comments on Hebrews 2:11 conclude with a discussion of the title "brethren," a plural of the key word "brother":

How great a difference is there between us and Him? He greatly humbles Himself when He honours us with the name brethren; otherwise we are not worthy to be considered less than His servants.¹⁵³

Sounding a note of continuity between Christ's pre-resurrection and post-resurrection body, Calvin observes that it is the glorified Christ who calls the godly brethren.¹⁵⁴

This title has the force of His carrying us up with Him into heaven. Whenever we hear ourselves called brethren by Christ, let us remember that He has clothed us (so to speak) with this quality so that we may obtain along with the name of brethren eternal life and every heavenly blessing.¹⁵⁵

Thus, although the simple relationship of the flesh due to the incarnation is an honor to the godly, salvation present and eternal are linked by Calvin with the title "brethren."

What, then, did Calvin mean when he identified incarnational communion to Peter Martyr with the handle carnem nostram induit, ut frater noster fieret eiusdem naturae particeps? What conclusions may we draw about this relation from the survey

¹⁵³Calvin, Hebrews, 27 (Heb. 2:11) [CO 55:29].

¹⁵⁴Calvin, Hebrews, 27 (Heb. 2:11) [CO 55:29]: "... Christ speaks here no more as a mortal man in the form of a servant but as He who has put on immortal glory after the resurrection."

¹⁵⁵Calvin, Hebrews, 27 (Heb. 2:11) [CO 55:29].

of Calvin's corpus?

First, a profound difference exists in Calvin's mind between incarnational communion and mystic or spiritual union with Christ. Mystic and spiritual union are peculiar to Christians alone, while incarnational communion applies to some extent to all humankind. Calvin appears to agree with Peter Martyr that incarnational communion is generalis in scope.

Second, without rebirth of the Spirit through faith, unbelievers do not have the honor of being one with Christ and only enjoy being born of the same source according to the flesh as Christ. This fact ensures that salvation can be found not from deity above or angels but from the comfort and encouragement of a brotherly human hand below. This hand that stretches out to them is not that of the babe in the manger. Instead, it is the nail-scarred hand of the risen Christ of salvation history.¹⁵⁶ It is a direct, tangible evangelism from God above to humankind below, but it does not ensure that humans, simply as such, have any part in Christ.

Calvin discounts the value of a mere fellowship in flesh. To the Christian, Christ is a true brother in the flesh and the spirit. To the non-Christian, however, who is cut off by ingratitude from what is offered, Christ is only a remote stranger. He or she is outside of Christ, as if to say that their common brotherhood in the flesh has been of no effect. An outstretched human hand that can save--though an objective fact--is of little good where it does not lead to mystical and spiritual union, which are required for true brotherhood with Christ. Therefore, Calvin appears to agree with the

¹⁵⁶See also Calvin, Hebrews, 364 (II Peter 3:9) [CO 55:475-476]; and Calvin, Tracts, 2:579.

Italian Reformer that incarnational communion is debilis and infirmis.

Finally, Calvin's preferred emphasis throughout is on Christ's relationship with the believer, not the unbeliever. The Reformer writes with the Christian community in mind, and even on the more general topic of the incarnation, Calvin stresses the benefits enjoyed by genuine Christians alone.¹⁵⁷ Johannine ingrafting language and the biblical phrase "in Christ" appear to be reserved by Calvin for the regenerate believer alone. The unbeliever's communion with Christ by virtue of the incarnation is only considered in passing by Calvin. Perhaps, however, this is in itself a difference between the two Reformers--at least in method of treatment--on incarnational communion: Calvin begins and ends in the church, only giving scant attention to those outside it, while Martyr starts outside and works his way in.

Christ's Conception

Like Peter Martyr, Calvin understands Christ's conception to have particular implications for his relationship to sinful men and women. Calvin never tired of insisting that Christ was of human seed.¹⁵⁸ Mary's seed or blood was involved in the conception process, rather than her merely being "a channel through which Christ

¹⁵⁷See also Calvin, Sermons on Deuteronomie, 337: "So then, whereas he is termed here a terrible and mightie God, it is not in respect of his owne people: but in respect of the unbeleeuers and infidels." Note that this sermon was written only days after Calvin wrote his letter to Martyr.

¹⁵⁸Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.13.1 (475) [CO 2:348]: "For this reason the Lord himself, not content with the name 'man,' frequently calls himself also 'Son of man,' meaning thereby to explain more clearly that he is a man truly begotten of human seed."

flowed."¹⁵⁹ The exact mechanics of conception, however, God leaves shrouded in mystery, according to the Reformer:

The angel does not define the means, so as to satisfy curiosity, for there was no need. He simply recalls the virgin to consider the power of the Holy Spirit, so that she may wholly yield herself to Him in quietness and peace¹⁶⁰

Calvin counsels a reverent restraint in our exegesis of such matters.¹⁶¹

But what of original sin? Did Calvin imagine that original sin touched Christ? Humanity had undergone a radical change since its creation, namely, the fall of humanity into sin. Man was not created sinful, but because of Adam's unfaithfulness in the garden, man's entire nature became corrupt and depraved.

Thus the root of sin is easily traced to the garden, but the more difficult questions regarding the nature of original sin and its transmission remain. For Calvin, original sin is

hereditary depravity and corruption of our nature, diffused into all parts of the soul, which first makes us liable to God's wrath, then also brings forth in us those works which Scripture calls 'works of the flesh' [Gal. 5:19].¹⁶²

¹⁵⁹John Calvin, Galatians, 73-74 (Gal. 4:4) [CO 50:227]: "He expressly intended to distinguish Christ from the rest of men as having been created of the seed of His mother and not by intercourse of man and woman." Also John Calvin, Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Isaiah, vol. 1, 248 (Is. 7:14) [CO 36:157]: "It is, therefore, plain enough that he speaks of *a virgin* who should conceive, not by the ordinary course of nature, but by the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit. . . . [H]e is conceived by the mother in such a manner as not to have a father on earth"

¹⁶⁰Calvin, Harmony of the Gospels, vol. 1, 28 (Lk. 1:35) [CO 45:30].

¹⁶¹Calvin, Harmony of the Gospels, vol. 1, 28 (Lk. 1:35) [CO 45:31]: "As God, in publishing His miracles, keeps back from us the means of His working, so on our part we must adore with restraint, what He wishes to keep hidden from us."

¹⁶²Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.1.8 (251) [CO 2:182].

All of humankind's faculties are affected by sin, including the intellect. This corruption is total, for "from the crown of the head to the sole of the foot, not a spark of good can be found."¹⁶³ We stand justly condemned and convicted before God. For this reason even infants themselves stand condemned in their mothers' wombs because of sin, for without guilt there would be no accusation.¹⁶⁴

In rejecting the pelagian view that sin is simply the result of imitation, Calvin asserts it is propagated through the race. In describing the transmission of sin, Calvin employs traditional language describing sin as "the hereditary depravity and corruption of our nature."¹⁶⁵ He also describes it as a "contagion" that spreads from Adam to all his descendants.¹⁶⁶

However, this transmission is not to be conceived of as natural, as if the cause of infection of sin lay in man's soul or body. Sin is not an inherited disease. Rather, Calvin clarifies the issue by appealing to God and his decision:

For the corruption of all mankind in the person of Adam alone did not proceed from generation but from the ordinance of God. As in one man He adorned us all, so He has also in him deprived us of His gifts. Therefore, we do not draw our individual vice and corruption from our parents but are alike corrupted in Adam alone, because immediately after his fall God took away from human

¹⁶³Calvin, Institutes (1559) III.14.1 (769) [CO 2:564].

¹⁶⁴Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.1.8 (251) [CO 2:182].

¹⁶⁵Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.1.8 (251) [CO 2:182].

¹⁶⁶Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.1.7 (250) [CO 2:182]. The Latin term Calvin uses is *contagio*. W. A. Hauck picks up on this language in his monograph on the subject asserting, "Dieser Ungehorsam Gott gegenüber ist in der menschlichen Natur begründet und wird darum wie eine Erbkrankheit als Bestandteil dieser menschlichen Natur auf die Nachkommen fortgeerbt." Wilhelm-Albert Hauck, "Sunde" and "Erbsunde" nach Calvin (Heidelberg: Evangelischer Verlag Jakob Comtesse, 1939), 95.

nature what He had given to it.¹⁶⁷

Elsewhere, Calvin states,

For the human race has not derived corruption through its descent from Adam; but that result is rather to be traced to the appointment of God, who, as he had adorned the whole nature of mankind with most excellent endowments in one man, so in the same man he again denuded it. But now, from the time in which we were corrupted in Adam, we do not bear the punishment of another's offense, but are guilty by our fault.¹⁶⁸

Yet why does Calvin employ language that can be misconstrued as teaching a natural, realistic transmission of sin? Though he uses these words, Calvin clarifies his meaning within the context. For example:

There is nothing absurd, then, in supposing that, when Adam was despoiled, human nature was left naked and destitute, or that when he was infected with sin, contagion crept into human nature. Hence, rotten branches came forth from a rotten root, which transmitted their rottenness to the other twigs sprouting from them. For thus were the children corrupted in the parent, so that they brought disease upon their children's children. That is, the beginning of corruption in Adam was such that it was conveyed in a perpetual stream from the ancestors into their descendants.¹⁶⁹

Clearly, this language could be understood as expressing a natural transmission of sin.

¹⁶⁷John Calvin, John 1-10, 66 (Jn. 3:6). CO 47:57.

¹⁶⁸John Calvin, Commentary on Genesis, trans. John King (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979), 156 (Genesis 3:6). CO 23:62. Elsewhere still, he states, "But we have to mark, that like as God created all mankind after his own image in the person of Adam: even so also through Adam's sin, not only Adam himself, but consequently also all his offspring were deprived and shut out from the grace that had been bestowed upon him. And whereof commeth that? Because we were all included within his person, according to the will of God. We must not here dispute by natural reason to know whether it be so or not. It behoves us to know, that it was God's will to give that to our first father which he would have us to be: and when he took the same from him, we also were in the same ruin and confusion with him. Then let us have an eye to this ordinance of God, let us settle our selves thereupon, and let us not believe our own wit and imagination." Calvin, Sermons on Job, 248. CO 33: 660-661.

¹⁶⁹Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.1.7 (250) [CO 2:181-182].

Yet Calvin continues:

For the contagion does not take its origin from the substance of the flesh or soul, but because it has been so ordained by God that the first man should at one and the same time have and lose, both for himself and for his descendants, the gifts that God had bestowed upon him.¹⁷⁰

Calvin uses natural language in order to show the real and vital connection between Adam and his descendants, but maintains that it is simply the ordinance of God that makes the link.¹⁷¹

There nevertheless remains the tension between the thought Calvin is communicating and the words he employs. Scholars who agree that Calvin is imputational in his understanding of original sin are undecided about the background of the language he is using.¹⁷² Wendel connects Calvin's language to that of Zwingli, who considered original sin to be a sort of inherited malady.¹⁷³ Parker suggests that Calvin is seeking to avoid Pelagian notions of imitation by employing natural language to affirm that original sin is a problem with which we are born. Parker also asserts that large portions of this chapter in the Institutes are essays having special reference to Augustine and Lombard.¹⁷⁴ Seeberg asserts that Calvin's conception of God's role in

¹⁷⁰Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.1.7 (250) [CO 2:182].

¹⁷¹Even Hauck admits, "Nicht durch stoffliche Infektion sind wir alle in die 'Erbsunde' verstrickt worden; der Vorgang, um den es sich hier handelt, ist rein geistiger Art." Hauck, 98.

¹⁷²T. H. L. Parker, Calvin: An Introduction to His Thought (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1995), 50-52; Francois Wendel, Calvin: Origins and Development of His Religious Thought (Durham, NC: The Labyrinth Press, 1987), 194-196; Niesel, The Theology of Calvin, 80-88; Reinhold Seeberg, History of Doctrines (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1954), 2:398-399.

¹⁷³Wendel, 194-195.

¹⁷⁴Parker, 50-52.

the transmission of original sin shows the influence of a Scotist element, while acknowledging that Calvin rejects the Scotist position, preferring a statement more along Augustinian lines.¹⁷⁵

In Institutes II.1.7 Calvin paraphrases Augustine who at this point in De Gratia Christi, et De Peccato Originali is also using the word "contagion." This word did not originate with Calvin, but is found in Augustine and other Medieval theologians such as Ambrose, Lombard, Bernard, Aquinas, Scotus, and Biel.¹⁷⁶ Niesel agrees that there is a patristic and medieval background to the language Calvin employs, but completely rejects the idea that he taught a natural transmission of original sin. The natural language is employed to affirm strongly our real and actual connection to Adam. "We are all involved with Adam in the solidarity of sin."¹⁷⁷ Thus Calvin employs realistic language to solidify our connection to Adam, but clarifies this language in order to avoid the concept of natural transmission of sin.

While the virginal conception of Christ is never in doubt for Calvin, this alone did not ensure that Christ was born without original sin. The Reformer also stresses the role of the Holy Spirit in Christ's conception:

For we make Christ free of all stain not just because he was begotten of his mother without copulation with man, but because he was sanctified by the Spirit that the generation might be pure and undefiled¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁵Seeberg, 398-399.

¹⁷⁶Both the terms *iniquat* and *contagio* are used frequently and consistently throughout the Latin fathers. Ambrose employs them over a dozen times, as does Augustine, Gregory I, Bernard and others. See Patrologia Latina Database.

¹⁷⁷Niesel, 86.

¹⁷⁸Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.13.4 (481) [CO 2:352].

Thus, the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit was critical to Christ's conception as a perfect man, and the "contagion" that "crept into human nature" never touched him.¹⁷⁹

This sanctifying work of the Spirit took place with regard to Christ's human nature, because the purity of his divinity was never in doubt.¹⁸⁰ Calvin identifies the Holy Spirit as the proper agent of the sanctification of Mary's seed and thus of Christ's original righteousness.

Calvin even dares to link the purity of Christ's humanity to Adam's unfallen human nature.¹⁸¹ Does this linkage and the spiritual sanctification of Mary's seed not mean that Christ was other than truly human or at least other than our kind of humanity? Calvin says no:

Nor do we imagine that Adam's seed is twofold, even though no infection came to Christ. For the generation of man is not unclean and vicious of itself, but is so as an accidental quality arising from the Fall. No wonder, then, that Christ,

¹⁷⁹Calvin, Harmony of the Gospels, vol. 1, 29 (Lk. 1:35) [CO 45:31-32]: "Thus though Christ was born of the seed of Abraham, he drew no contagion from that blemished nature, for from the very first, God's Spirit kept him pure, not merely that He should abound in holiness unto Himself alone, but rather that He should make others holy. The very mode of his conception testifies that He was set apart from sinners to be our Mediator." Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.1.7 (250) [CO 2:181]: ". . . when Adam was despoiled . . . or when he was infected with sin, contagion crept into human nature." Calvin also stresses Christ's positive possession of holiness from the Spirit: "Thus, he was conceived of the Holy Spirit in order that, in the flesh taken, fully imbued with the holiness of the Spirit, he might impart that holiness to us." Calvin, Institutes (1559) IV.16.18 (1341) [CO 2:989].

¹⁸⁰Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.13.4 (481) [CO 2:352]: "And this remains for us an established fact: whenever Scripture calls our attention to the purity of Christ, it is to be understood of his true human nature, for it would have been superfluous to say that God is pure. Also, the sanctification of which John, ch. 17, speaks would have no place in divine nature [John 17:19]."

¹⁸¹Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.13.4 (481) [CO 2:352]: ". . . he was sanctified by the Spirit that the generation might be pure and undefiled as would have been true before Adam's fall."

through whom integrity was to be restored, was exempted from common corruption!¹⁸²

The purity of Christ's conception does not cause him to be substantially other than we are: he is still our brother. Fallenness is an accidental, not a substantial, quality of human nature, so that Christ can be from the seed of Adam without uncleanness.¹⁸³

The profound nature of this accidental difference must not be underestimated.¹⁸⁴

Calvin's understanding of Christ's conception is compatible with that of Peter Martyr Vermigli.

Calviniana Secondary Literature

Having examined John Calvin's understanding of incarnational communion with Christ using the key phrases and themes in which he identified it to Peter Martyr, as well as the Genevan's statements on Christ's conception, we turn to secondary literature. As mentioned earlier, Tamburello's study, while a fine one, does not treat incarnational communion. The same can be said of Kolffhaus's earlier work and most

¹⁸²Calvin, Institutes (1559) II.13.4 (481) [CO 2:352].

¹⁸³This reading of Calvin is confirmed by Bromiley when contrasting the Reformer with Barth: "Like the Fathers, however, Calvin gave the sinlessness a broader reach when he acutely pointed out that . . . human nature is intrinsically good as created, and only accidentally vicious" (G. W. Bromiley, "The Reformers and the Humanity of Christ," in Perspectives on Christology: Essays in Honor of Paul K. Jewett, ed. M. Shuster and R. Muller (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1991). Muller makes the same point from a slightly different angle: "In the interest of establishing the integrity of this sanctified humanity as humanity, Calvin stresses the bestowing of 'gifts' upon Christ by the Spirit as distinct from the issue of the *communicatio idiomatum* within the person of the incarnate one." Muller, 28.

¹⁸⁴Calvin, First Corinthians, 339 (I Cor. 15:45) [CO 49:553]: "Adam and Christ are therefore, as it were, the two origins, or roots of the human race. That is why there is every justification for calling Adam the first man, and Christ the last."

of the studies we cited that treat union with Christ in greater or lesser detail. We will now examine the works which do treat incarnational union or communion.¹⁸⁵

Willis notes that the hypostatic union itself is indeed presupposed by the particular union of Christ with believers.¹⁸⁶ But on this fact all must agree: the hypostatic union is presupposed by the whole course of Calvin's faith.¹⁸⁷ The real issue at stake is the *nature* of the relation set up by the hypostatic union between Christ's humanity and that of other human beings, especially unbelievers. The brevity of Willis' treatment prevents us from even beginning to ascertain his opinion on that important matter.¹⁸⁸

Nevin makes more than a passing comment about incarnational communion in his treatment of Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper.¹⁸⁹ In probing "the nature of the

¹⁸⁵Further consideration of Torrance's comments on Calvin will be reserved until Chapter 5.

¹⁸⁶See footnote 5 above.

¹⁸⁷In turn, there are other parts of salvation-history always in view. For example: "To this day we cannot enjoy the blessing brought to us in Christ without thinking at the same time of that which God gave as adornment and honour to Mary, in willing her to be the mother of His only-begotten Son." Calvin, Harmony of the Gospels, vol. 1, 32 (Lk. 1:42) [CQ 45:35].

¹⁸⁸The same is true of Gerrish's passing reference to incarnational communion: "The communion in question [mystical communion] is something subsequent to the union with Christ that was already effected by the incarnation, but antecedent to the communication of his benefits." Gerrish, Grace and Gratitude, 128.

¹⁸⁹John Williamson Nevin (1803-1886) studied at Princeton under Charles Hodge but later became a national authority on German theology and philosophy, teaching theology at the German Reformed Theological Seminary in Mercersburg, Pennsylvania. His book The Mystical Presence (1846) was written in polemic against his former Princeton professor concerning Calvin's doctrine of the Eucharist. See James Hastings Nichols, The Mercersburg Theology (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), 3-10.

communion which holds between Christ and his people" in Calvin's theology, Nevin begins with a paragraph on incarnational communion.

The union of *believers* with Christ is not simply that of a common humanity, as derived from *Adam*. In this view, all men partake of one and the same nature, and each may be said to be in relation to his neighbour bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh. So Christ took not on him the nature of angels, but of men. He was born of a woman, and appeared among us in the likeness and fashion of our own life, only without sin. But plainly our relation to his nature, and through this to his mediatorial work, as christians, is something quite different from this general consanguinity of the human race. Where we are said to be of the same life with him, 'members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones,' it is not on the ground merely of our participation with him in the nature of Adam, but on the ground of our participation in his own nature as a higher order of life. Our relation to him is not circuitous and collateral only; it holds in a direct connection with his person.¹⁹⁰

Nevin does not think that Christ's consubstantiality with man via the hypostatic union explains the believer's union with Christ. More than neighborly relations are required to participate in Christ's mediatorial work. A direct connection with the person of Christ is needed, not just one via nature. Here we find confirmation of our reading of Calvin on incarnational communion.

As noted in Chapter 1, Hendry sees Calvin's repeated stress on spiritual union with Christ in Book III of the *Institutes* as emptying meaning from the Reformer's earlier treatment of incarnational union in Book II.¹⁹¹ Thus, for Hendry incarnational and spiritual union are different moments in Calvin's theology.

Hendry's point is that Calvin's doctrine of the believer's union with Christ

¹⁹⁰Nevin, 55.

¹⁹¹Hendry, 70: "As we read what Calvin has to say about spiritual union between Christ and his church--and this is a theme on which he loves to dilate--it becomes difficult to believe that any meaning is left to the natural relation between Christ and humanity of which he spoke in the earlier context."

cannot accommodate an inner ontological relation between Christ and all humankind. Thus, Christ--so far as his humanity is concerned--is no more or less than other men: similar in being to all others of the species, sin excepted.¹⁹² This conclusion complements the theme of Christ's universal brotherhood we found in Calvin, while at the same time implying that only believers have a saving internal relation to Christ via the Spirit, denominated by the term "ingrafting."¹⁹³ Hendry's twofold division of Calvin's union with Christ reflects the incarnational and mystical communions our study has found in Calvin.

Unfortunately, Hendry's treatment is hampered by a lack of precision. The "ontological relation" he sees in the Christ of the East is so poorly defined and the effects that supposedly flow from it are so contingent as to make it quite ambiguous.¹⁹⁴

¹⁹²Thus, Hendry classifies Calvin as a Western theologian in his schema on Christ's consubstantiality with man. Furthermore, Hendry charges Calvin with a failure to integrate christology and soteriology. Hendry's blunt conclusion about Calvin's doctrine of union with Christ is most telling: "It is evident that Calvin has in effect moved away from the classical incarnational conception of the relation of Christ to humanity, in spite of the very sympathetic attitude toward it that he showed in his treatment of the incarnation. Calvin's attempt to combine the norms of the Eastern and Western churches succeeded only in demonstrating the depth of the difference between them." Hendry, 71.

¹⁹³Tamburello lists twenty occurrences of insero or insitio in the 1559 Institutes and thirteen in Calvin's commentaries (Tamburello, p. 111). In our readings and word searches, we have found an additional thirteen occurrences of "graft" and its cognates. Each of these refer only to believers in their relation to Christ.

¹⁹⁴For example, Hendry even opens his first description of the Eastern conception with the caveat: "The idea is not an easy one to express, and it is far from clear what it meant even to those fathers who have given it fullest expression (the interpretation of their texts has never ceased to be controversial)" (Hendry, 44). On Athanasius, Hendry admits: "It never becomes clear, however, how this bodily relation is to be understood" and ". . . nowhere does he tell us precisely in what it consists, or how the benefit of the redemption accomplished by the incarnate Word comes to us through it" (Hendry, 47-48). This same ambiguity is repeated for Gregory of Nyssa, Hilary of

In all fairness, Hendry makes this point repeatedly, both explicitly and implicitly. The main thesis of his book is founded upon just this fact!¹⁹⁵

Nevertheless, his treatment of Calvin is weakened by this underlying ambiguity: it is inevitably difficult to eliminate a nebulous possibility.¹⁹⁶ Thus, Hendry's judgment on Calvin's doctrine of union with Christ may be little more than a choice between the mere categories of an "internal" and an "external" relation of Christ to all men.¹⁹⁷ This crude categorization may not, however, be adequate to bring out Calvin's thoughts on the subject, much less the true reality of the situation.¹⁹⁸

Inadequate classification of Calvin's opinions on important theological topics is not unknown. Willis draws attention to the potential for this problem in Calvin studies, especially for those probing Calvin's thought on union with Christ:

As is often the case with a fundamental assumption which influences a thinker's work at every point, there is a richness of language used in describing it that can be confusing. This is particularly true when it comes to what is meant by the union with Christ¹⁹⁹

Poitiers, and Cyril of Alexandria. Hendry summarizes: "Though some of the fathers come near to putting it this way, yet no one ever taught a salvation that was purely automatic. One way or another, the salvation accomplished by Christ has to be appropriated by the individual." Hendry, 57.

¹⁹⁵See Hendry, 9.

¹⁹⁶This applies whether or not Hendry's interpretation of the Eastern Fathers and tradition is correct.

¹⁹⁷Hendry's "ontological relation" is more of an internal category, even if it is in some sense contingent or not automatic. Hendry is especially shocked by Calvin's external relation of Christ to man.

¹⁹⁸Pannenberg has called attention to another polar set of categories that are fundamentally inadequate to describe the problems of christology--"static" and "dynamic." See Pannenberg, 302.

¹⁹⁹Willis-Watkins, 78.

Caution and sensitivity are in order.

In a study of Calvin's anthropology, Engel has proposed that the richness of the Reformer's thought has been a stumbling block to many previous studies of his doctrine of man.²⁰⁰ Moving beyond what she calls the three previous theses of pessimism, optimism, and contradiction for interpreting Calvin's anthropology, Engel demonstrates that Calvin's doctrine of man is

an intricate complex of a wide variety of assertions and judgments about humankind, each one reflecting a different theological perspective. . . . The overall impression one is left with is that for Calvin the human creature is such a complex reality that only a complex, dynamic model of interpretation is adequate to understand it.²⁰¹

Her work is the second full-length study of Calvin's anthropology, the first having been published in 1949 by T. F. Torrance.²⁰²

²⁰⁰Mary Potter Engel, John Calvin's Perspectival Anthropology, American Academy of Religion Academy Series, no. 52, ed. Susan Thistlethwaite (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988). In her research she found "a more complicated anthropology in Calvin's theology than previously described in the literature" (Engel, vii). Benjamin Farley calls Engel's book "a rare and commanding analysis of the Reformer's anthropological views" and further notes that "Calvin specialists should certainly welcome this book as well as find her principle of interpretation illuminating and useful" (Benjamin W. Farley, Review of John Calvin's Perspectival Anthropology by Mary Potter Engel, in Theology Today 45: 508).

²⁰¹Engel, xi. The thesis of pessimism focuses attention upon "the absolute submission of the human creature to the almighty power of God and the total depravity of the sinner before God the righteous judge." The thesis of optimism focuses attention upon "the contribution of Calvin to the modern understanding of human freedom and dignity." The thesis of contradiction "argues that Calvin's anthropology has no single focus or emphasis because it is a realistic anthropology reflecting the contradictory anthropologies of the scriptures. . ." (Engel, x-xi). All previous studies fall into one of these three categories.

²⁰²Engel, ix. The first book-length study of Calvin's anthropology was T. F. Torrance, Calvin's Doctrine of Man (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949). Engel interacts with a wide range of Calvin studies, including works in German, French, and Italian (Engel, xii-xiii, n. 2). Her command of historical and cultural currents in

Engel posits "a definite and constant set of shifting perspectives that are contradictory yet complementary" in Calvin's anthropology, each of which integrates into Calvin's periodization of salvation-history.²⁰³ Two perspectives in Calvin's doctrine of man are the most basic:

Pervading all Calvin's comments on humankind is a basic distinction between the perspective of God and the perspective of humankind. Each of these perspectives represents a different vantage point for viewing and evaluating the human creature and leads to different knowledge about the self.²⁰⁴

Engel's integration of these two major perspectives with salvation-history produces her operative set of perspectives.²⁰⁵ Using "this set of perspectives as an interpretative tool helps to make sense out of Calvin's disparate anthropological statements."²⁰⁶ This "anthropological complex" that Engel finds in Calvin's texts--while intricate--is compelling due to the elegant simplicity with which it explains the available data, not

Calvin's day is impressive. Engel's study is the first step in her wider attempt to clarify the relationship between Calvin's anthropology and that of the Florentine Platonists Marsilio Ficino and Pico della Mirandola. Engel, vii.

²⁰³Engel, xi. Building on the three-fold structure of salvation-history in the Institutes observed by Gerrish, Engel employs a simplified schema of two periods in salvation-history: creation and fall/redemption (Engel, 2-3). See B. A. Gerrish, Reformers in Profile (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), 155.

²⁰⁴Engel, 1. Engel's two major perspectives are in some ways similar to but not dependant upon Dowey's distinction between knowledge of God as creator and knowledge of God as redeemer (see Engel, 3-4). See E. A. Dowey, Jr., The Knowledge of God in Calvin's Theology, 2nd ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1965).

²⁰⁵These are the perspective of God as creator, the perspective of God as judge, and the perspective of God as redeemer, as well as the perspective of humankind as created, the perspective of humankind as judged, and the perspective of humankind as redeemed. At times Engel simplifies the schema, treating only the major perspectives, when the influence of salvation-history is less germane to Calvin's concern. Engel, 17.

²⁰⁶Engel, xi.

because it was necessarily used by the Reformer self-consciously.²⁰⁷

While Engel's study only seeks minimally to prove that a perspectival approach to Calvin's anthropology texts is helpful to understanding those texts, there is no reason why her methodology could not equally apply to other doctrines in Calvin's thought.²⁰⁸ Thus, our interest in her study is to see how this methodology might help clarify Calvin's apparently contradictory statements about the theme Christ as brother, which is so integrally related to his doctrine of union with Christ.²⁰⁹

If Engel's multi-perspectivalism is applied to the theme of Christ as brother, a different set of perspectives emerges. From the perspective of God as creator, Jesus Christ is the brother of all humans. From the perspective of God as judge, Jesus Christ is the brother of all the condemned. From the perspective of God as redeemer, Jesus

²⁰⁷Engel, xi-xii. Jill Raitt welcomes Engel's perspectival treatment: "Engel explains seeming contradictions and contraries in Calvin's anthropology by analyzing them from Calvin's own shifting perspectives as Engel argues persuasively" (see Jill Raitt, Review of John Calvin's Perspectival Anthropology by Mary Potter Engel, in Sixteenth Century Journal 21 (1990): 324-325). However, Engel's approach is not without its critics. Tony Lane notes that Engel's case "would be strengthened if she were to broaden it to include other factors," such as the influence of the various contexts and opponents Calvin faced, or "the contrast between a cruder and a more nuanced form of teaching." A. N. S. Lane, Review of John Calvin's Perspectival Anthropology by Mary Potter Engel, in Themelios 16 (1991): 21-22.

²⁰⁸Engel acknowledges this point: "It is my belief that this thesis concerning the distinction of the human and divine perspectives in its variations has implications for the adequate interpretation of other doctrines in Calvin's theology (such as justification and sanctification, grace and works). It has been the aim of this study, however, to argue *only* that this distinction enables us to interpret Calvin's anthropology more accurately." Engel, 194, n. 7.

²⁰⁹See footnotes 124-125 above. Our further application of Engel's theory to the theme of Christ's brotherhood and union with Christ is invited by Charles Partee, who, in his review of Engel's volume, complains that it omits any reference to Christ's humanity. Charles Partee, Review of John Calvin's Perspectival Anthropology by Mary Potter Engel, in Journal of Religion 69 (1989): 553-554.

Christ is the brother of all the redeemed. From the perspective of humankind as creatures, Jesus Christ is the truly human brother of all. From the perspective of humankind as judged, Jesus Christ is the brother of all the judged. From the perspective of humankind as redeemed, Jesus Christ is the brother of all the redeemed.

This set of perspectives more than covers the data we have found in Calvin's texts on the theme of Christ as brother, which is the focal point of his understanding of incarnational union.²¹⁰ Calvin's more universal statements about Christ's being the brother of all men reflect the perspective of humankind as the created.²¹¹ To every man and woman, Jesus Christ is a brother in the flesh, holding salvation out to them with a human hand. Calvin's more particular statements about Christ's being only the brother of believers reflects the perspective of God as redeemer.²¹² In the eyes of God, Christ is brother and God is Father only to those redeemed by the Spirit.

With this multi-perspectivalism in mind, Calvin's theme of Christ as brother ties in quite nicely with our previous discoveries about incarnational, mystical, and spiritual communion. The broader, universal brotherhood statements, made from the perspective of humankind as created, have only incarnational communion in view. The more narrow, particular brotherhood statements, made from the perspective of God as

²¹⁰The fact that not all the perspectives are needed to explain the data is not a weakness in the analysis. As long as the two major perspectives of God and humankind are covered, it merely reflects a particular emphasis in Calvin's theme. Even Engel does not use all of the six perspectives to explain every theme.

²¹¹See footnotes 124 and 130-138 above.

²¹²See footnotes 125, 140, and 143-146 above. Other studies have noticed a pattern of universal and particular perspectives in Calvin's theology. See Muller, 33-35.

redeemer, have not only incarnational communion but also mystical and spiritual communion in view.

Close examination of the secondary literature germane to our topic serves to confirm the conclusions drawn from our study of Calvin's wider corpus and to offer a new method for the insightful organization of that data.

Conclusion

Calvin's use of Johannine ingrafting language and the biblical phrase "in Christ" is reserved for mystical and spiritual communion. Calvin does, however, teach different degrees of union with Christ, which flow out of different kinds of communion or communication with Christ. Each involves different sets of persons, as becomes apparent from close examination of his correspondence with Peter Martyr. The hypostatic union and resultant incarnational communion involve the man Jesus, who in his humanity is a man just like other men, sin excepted. Mystic communion is a definitive sacred ingrafting into the life of Jesus Christ by the action of the Holy Spirit upon faith. Spiritual communion is the progressive enjoyment of the Spirit and blessings of Christ's life that flow from mystic union.

The marked difference between the status of unbelievers versus believers in their relationship to Christ--Calvin's acceptance of Martyr's debilis and infirmus--puts a clear theological division between incarnational communion on the one hand, and mystical and spiritual communion on the other. For Calvin, the believer's spiritual union with Christ is another union in addition to our incarnational union with him.

CHAPTER 4

KARL BARTH ON UNION WITH CHRIST

We cannot say that they have a share in it, that they are all "in Christ." This would mean that what happened for them had also happened to them and in them. This would mean their recognition and knowledge of its occurrence for them. . . . We cannot say this when we say that they are fellows of Jesus Christ and that He is their Fellow. What we do say, what we can and must say, is that they have all been chosen from eternity to be "in Christ" in this sense, that this is their determination, and that they exist in their time for this, i.e., with this meaning and higher purpose. Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics III/4, 577.

Having made this point, we may now proceed to state that the fellowship of Christians with Christ, which is the goal of vocation, is a perfect fellowship inasmuch as what takes place in it is no less than their union with Christ. Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics IV/3.2, 540.

In this fourth chapter, our purpose is to discover the doctrine of union with Christ in the theology of Karl Barth. As in previous cases, our attention will particularly be drawn to the way in which Barth relates the doctrine of union with Christ and the incarnation. Sensitivity to historical context will be maintained, so that we might listen as closely as possible to Barth's voice, rather than to an echo of our own or any one else's. No particular citations will be given to show that Barth's doctrine of union with Christ influenced Torrance's own views. However, Torrance's wide appeals to his Basel mentor--especially in the area of christology--make this examination of Barth's doctrine exceedingly germane to our growing appreciation of Torrance's treatment of union with Christ.

Barth's corpus is a formidable bulk, even when measured against the most prolific Christian theologians. Thus, for our purposes here, some limiting strategy is in

order.¹ G. W. Bromiley, co-editor and co-translator of the Church Dogmatics, locates Barth's "fine treatment" of the doctrine of union with Christ in § 71.3 of the Church Dogmatics.² In his introduction to Barth's theology, Bromiley notes that this section was the first occasion on which Barth developed his doctrine of union with Christ.³

While the observations of an authority such as Bromiley might justify focusing attention on this section in the Church Dogmatics alone, in the final sentences of § 71.3, Barth explicitly links his treatment of union with Christ to "the mystery and miracle of Christmas," which is germane to our overall topic.⁴ Thus, our quest for Barth's doctrine of union with Christ will primarily focus upon § 15 and § 71.3, but we will also consult material from elsewhere in the Church Dogmatics, as well as from his wider corpus and secondary sources.

The Mystery and Miracle of Christmas

Barth divides § 15 into three sections. Section § 15.1, "The Problem of Christology," is almost exclusively historical in nature. Here Barth briefly identifies the

¹The precedent of employing limiting strategies in Barth studies is clearly established. See Richard H. Roberts, A Theology on Its Way? Essays on Karl Barth (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991), 95.

²G. W. Bromiley, "Karl Barth," in Creative Minds in Contemporary Theology (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966), 58. Bromiley cites Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics IV/3.2, ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, trans. G. W. Bromiley (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1962), 520-554. All future citations of this set of volumes will be abbreviated CD.

³G. W. Bromiley, Introduction to the Theology of Karl Barth (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979), 229.

⁴Barth, CD IV/3.2, 554. Barth is particularly alluding to § 15, which is Barth, CD I/2, 122-202.

central testimony of church dogma about christology: "Jesus Christ is very God and very Man." Section § 15.2 explores this key christological statement in fuller dogmatic detail and is thus titled "Very God and Very Man." Here Barth expounds his doctrine of Christ's fallen humanity, the focal point of the second section. The final section, § 15.3 "The Miracle of Christmas," is Barth's spirited defense of the virgin birth, which indicates the mystery of the vere Deus vere homo and is the crescendo of § 15.

Given Barth's elaborate and winding method of argument, we will first survey each of these three sections, later reflecting on our theme in light of them and key secondary sources.

The Problem of Christology

Barth begins § 15.1 with a familiar question: "Who is Jesus Christ?"⁵ His answer comes so quickly--"Jesus Christ is very God and very Man"--that this simple statement in itself can hardly be the great obstacle to christology Barth senses. Rather, Barth is most concerned that this ancient answer is materially assaulted by Herder, Ritschl, and von Harnack.⁶ Having voiced his support for primitive christology's answer, Barth proposes to re-examine this two-fold explanation in its proper revelational light:

⁵Barth, CD I/2, 122. In § 15, Barth introduces "a few fundamental clarifications" of his christology. His "complete doctrine of the person of Christ" is "put back to the much later context of the doctrine of God the Reconciler" in CD IV, which he never completely finished (Barth, CD I/2, 124).

⁶Barth, CD I/2, 127-131. This long, small-print section is the crescendo of § 15.1. In it, Barth concludes that the charge of "intellectualism" against the early church formulation is really directed at "the offense of revelation which was, of course, very abruptly formulated in the two-nature doctrine of the Early Church" (Barth, CD I/2, 129).

Christology deals with the revelation of God as a mystery. It must first of all be aware of this mystery and then acknowledge it as such. It must assume its position at the place where the curtain of the Old Testament is drawn back and the presence of the Son of God in the flesh is visible and is seen as an event; yet visible and seen as the event in which, in the midst of the times, in the simple datable happening of the existence of Jesus, a "man like as we are," God the Lord was directly and once for all the acting Subject.⁷

Thus, Barth is highlighting Jesus Christ as an event of secret revelation.

Very God and Very Man

In § 15.2, Barth turns in a familiar direction to expound the secret of Christ: an exposition of John 1:14, "The Word was made flesh."⁸ Barth had previously lectured on this topic at Münster in 1925 and at Bonn in 1933.⁹ Barth lets John 1:14 guide his discussion of the dogmatic statement, "Jesus Christ is very God and very man," dividing his treatment into three sections by Roman numerals.

In the first subsection (§ 15.2.I), Barth makes four points about "the Word" of John 1:14. First, in the incarnation, the Word is active subject, not a product of creation.¹⁰ Second, the incarnation takes place in the divine freedom of the Word and

⁷Barth, CD I/2, 131. Note that the translator has consistently rendered the technical term "das Geheimnis," referring to a revelation which though revealed remains a secret, as "mystery." This should not be confused with the Latinate root of mysterium.

⁸Barth calls John 1:14 "the central New Testament statement." Thus, "this New Testament verse must guide us in our discussion of the dogmatic statement that Jesus Christ is very God and very man" (Barth, CD I/2, 132).

⁹These lectures on John 1:14 have been published in translation as Karl Barth, Witness to the Word: A Commentary on John 1, ed. Walther Fürst, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 84-102.

¹⁰Barth, CD I/2, 134.

is not an absolute necessity for God.¹¹ Third, the Word is still free though incarnate, making the statement "very God and very man" irreversible and all abstract considerations of Jesus or his manifestation as its subject illegitimate.¹² Finally, while rejecting Mariology, Barth endorses the description of Mary as "mother of God" because it stresses that Christ was made of Mary's substance and that she bore God's Son.¹³

In the second subsection (§ 15.2.II), Barth makes four points about "the flesh" of John 1:14. First,

That the Word was made "flesh" means first and generally that He became man, true and real man, participating in the same human essence and existence, the same human nature and form, the same historicity that we have. God's revelation to us takes place in such a way that everything ascribable to man, his creaturely existence as an individually unique unity of body and soul in the time between birth and death, can now be predicated of God's eternal Son as well.¹⁴

Second, Barth cautiously describes neutral human nature, nearly hesitating to call Christ "a man."¹⁵ Third, Barth breaks with tradition and a merely neutral description of

¹¹Barth, CD I/2, 135.

¹²Barth, CD I/2, 136. In the small print section that follows, Barth particularly attacks the Roman Catholic Heart of Jesus cult and the Neo-Protestant interest in Jesus as a religious hero for making Christ's human nature its subject (Barth, CD I/2, 127-128). Instead, Barth emphasizes the "secret," stressing that the revelation never becomes fully historical: "The objection is that by direct glorification of Christ's humanity as such the divine Word is evaded and camouflaged. For when we are speaking of Jesus Christ, this Word does not possess its human-ness as an 'object of manifestation' alongside Itself" (Barth, CD I/2, 128).

¹³Barth, CD I/2, 138-146.

¹⁴Barth, CD I/2, 147. Note Barth's emphasis on the historic concreteness of Christ's humanity, rather than on some abstract essentialist concept of human nature.

¹⁵Barth, CD I/2, 149: "That the Word became flesh means, indeed, that He became a man. But we have to be careful about the sense in which alone this can be said. . . . Now since this cannot be real except in the concrete reality of one man, it must at once

Christ's human nature by asserting the continuity of Christ's flesh with ours in its fallenness.¹⁶ Finally, Barth asserts the discontinuity of Christ's flesh with ours in that it has been sanctified or hallowed by the Word's taking of it.¹⁷ We shall return to these important themes later when reflecting upon our topic.

In the third subsection (§ 15.2.III), Barth discusses the "became" of John 1:14, revisiting the content of the first subsection:

To understand the miraculous act of this becoming, we must reach back to what we have acknowledged under I, that it is to be understood as an act of the Word who is the Lord. . . . Accordingly, we have to give a closer explanation of the act peculiar to this miracle, the incarnation of the Word.¹⁸

Barth accepts "the Word assumed flesh" as a paraphrase of John 1:14, since it guards against misunderstandings that might arise from the unio naturarum.¹⁹ But he wants to say more. Thus, Barth turns in a direction with which we are familiar from Chapter 1, to "a doctrine unanimously sponsored by early theology in its entirety, that of the *anhypostasis* and *enhypostasis* of the human nature of Christ."²⁰ Note Barth's

be said that He became a man. But precisely this concrete reality of a man, this man, is itself the work of the Word, not His presupposition."

¹⁶Barth, CD I/2, 151-155. We have already encountered Barth's doctrine of the fallen humanity of Christ in Chapter 1. When reflecting upon his fuller treatment of "very God and very man," we shall revisit this teaching.

¹⁷Barth, CD I/2, 155-156.

¹⁸Barth, CD I/2, 160. Note the continuing stress on Christ as event. Barth underscores the importance of this becoming in that he says it "points to the centre, to the mystery of revelation, the happening of the inconceivable fact that God is among us and with us" (Barth, CD I/2, 159).

¹⁹Barth contrasts Eastern and Lutheran attitudes on the unio naturarum to the Western and Reformed emphasis upon the unio personalis (Barth, CD I/2, 161-162).

²⁰Barth, CD I/2, 163.

definitions of these terms:

Anhypostasis asserts the negative. Since in virtue of the ἐγένετο, i.e., in virtue of the *assumptio*, Christ's human nature has its existence--the ancients said, its subsistence--in the existence of God, meaning in the mode of being (*hypostasis*, "person") of the Word, it does not possess it in and for itself, *in abstracto*. Apart from the divine mode of being whose existence it acquires it has none of its own; i.e., apart from its concrete existence in God in the event of the *unio*, it has no existence of its own, it is ἀνυπόστατος. *Enhypostasis* asserts the positive. In virtue of the ἐγένετο, i.e., in virtue of the *assumptio*, the human nature acquires existence (subsistence) in the existence of God, meaning in the mode of being (*hypostasis*, "person") of the Word. This divine mode of being gives it existence in the event of the *unio*, and in this way it has a concrete existence of its own, it is ἐνυπόστατος.²¹

Barth summarizes his understanding of this patristic doctrine:

We have seen earlier that what the eternal Word made His own, giving it thereby His own existence, was not a man, but man's nature, man's being, and so not a second existence but a second possibility of existence, to wit, that of a man.²²

In passing, Barth also warns against modern psychologized misunderstandings of

anhypostasis.²³

Barth's interest in anhypostasis and enhypostasis was not fundamentally patristic. He saw it as the backdrop for the post-Reformation christological debate between Lutheran and Reformed theology. Thus, Barth again turns to the Reformed doctrine of the unio personalis, objecting to the Lutheran unio naturarum because it establishes a reciprocal relation between the creator and creature and institutes a state

²¹Barth, CD I/2, 163. Barth saw the purpose of this doctrine as "to guard against the idea of a double existence of Christ as Logos and as Man, an idea inevitably bound to lead either to Docetism or to Ebionitism" (Barth, CD I/2, 163).

²²Barth, CD I/2, 163. Hence, Barth's caution in his treatment of Christ's manhood in the previous subsection.

²³Barth has in mind those who interpret anhypostasis as implying that Christ had no human personality (Barth, CD I/2, 164-165).

of revealedness instead of an event of revelation.²⁴ Yes, the incarnation is "an accomplished fact," but it is "completed *event*," Barth stresses.²⁵ He identifies this event character of the incarnation as central to a proper understanding:

The reality of Jesus Christ is an objective fact. It is this that gives Christology, so to speak, its ontological reference. And we undoubtedly have to do justice to his reference.²⁶

But who does Barth have in mind when so stressing act and event?

Have not Luther and the Lutherans ventured too much in their attempt at such a simple reversal of the statement about the *enhypostasis* of the humanity of Christ, or at the completion of it by a statement about the "enfleshment" of the Word in the exclusive sense?²⁷

Barth suggests as an alternative solution that the Lutherans ought to have either kept silent or explained "it at once by a counter-statement, since it obviously cannot be explained in and by itself."²⁸

For his own part, Barth follows the Reformed teaching on these issues, but reconstructs the older doctrine of the incarnation in light of the event or act of

²⁴Barth notes that most of the Reformed taught a sustentatio of the humanity by the Word in the union, while others like Wolleib went so far as to teach a communicavit. The Lutherans, on the other hand, went even further than either of the Reformed schools, teaching a communis participatio between the two natures, anticipating their fuller communicatio idiomatum (Barth, CD I/2, 163-164).

²⁵Barth, CD I/2, 165.

²⁶Barth, CD I/2, 165. This characteristic of Christ as act or event is necessary because of God's freedom.

²⁷Barth, CD I/2, 167. Here Barth notes the "spatial limiting" implicit in the Lutheran doctrine. Is this a source behind Torrance's controversial comments on the Lutheran "receptacle notion of space"? Compare Torrance, Space, Time and Incarnation, 30-32; A. E. Taylor, Aristotle (New York: Dover, 1955), 64; and Wolfhart Pannenberg, Systematic Theology; vol. 2, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 88, n. 228.

²⁸Barth, CD I/2, 167.

revelation.

In the tracks of this event and by following these tracks we recognize the reality attested to us. The relevance of Christology from this standpoint will acquire a noetic character, and we cannot deny that this is meaningful and legitimate.²⁹

This especially is important for the Reformed extra-Calvinisticum, which Barth traces from Athanasius through both the Eastern and the Western church even down to

Luther. The Reformed

wished the *extra* to be regarded, not as *separative*, but as *distinctive*. Along with the *extra* they also asserted the *intra* with thoroughgoing seriousness. With the Lutherans they asserted a *praesentia intima perpetua* of the Logos in the flesh, i.e., in the sense of what Luther really meant to assert, an *ubiquitas humanae naturae* in virtue of the *operatio gloriosa* of the exalted God-Man (Wendelin, *op. cit.*).³⁰

Thus, Barth concludes, the Reformed respected both the λόγος ἄσαρκος and the λόγος ἐνσαρκος, wanting only "to reject that [Lutheran] reversal of the *enhypostasis*, by which, it seemed to them, either the divinity or the humanity as such was imperilled."³¹ Barth closes by questioning whether even the Reformed view, which does such justice to the dynamic, noetic aspect of christology, also does justice to the static, ontic aspect. Thus, he hints, it may be best "to drop all reflections upon the way

²⁹Barth, CD I/2, 167. In this noetic reference, the incarnation does not cease to be a secret revelation: "To begin with, we are set a riddle. From the very start we are also shown that the solution of it is to hand. But it is still a riddle which is followed by the solution. Man in his humiliation, God in his exaltation, or the God-Man in his veiling and also in His unveiling: these constitute two coherent steps, inseparably linked, yet also clearly distinct" (Barth, CD I/2, 167-168). This unresolved contrast of humiliation and exaltation becomes a major motif in CD IV.

³⁰Barth, CD I/2, 169.

³¹Barth, CD I/2, 169-170.

to it"³² However, in his final summary statement for § 15.2, Barth evenhandedly proposes the other option he had previously suggested for the Lutheran quandry:

Perhaps if there is to be Evangelical theology at all--and truly so, it may be, only when this necessity is perceived--there always has to be a static and a dynamic, an ontic and a noetic principle, not in nice equilibrium, but calling each other and questioning each other. That is, there must be Lutherans and Reformed: not in the shadow of a unitary theology, but as a twofold theological school³³

The Miracle of Christmas

Barth's third and final section of § 15 is his spirited defense of the virgin birth of Christ:

It is this mystery of Christmas which is indicated in Scripture and in church dogma by reference to the miracle of Christmas. This miracle is the conception of Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost or His birth of the Virgin Mary.³⁴

Barth first faces the host of questions about the biblical statements on the issue, but then decides that such "literary questions" are not ultimately determinative.³⁵ Next

Barth notes:

The dogma of the Virgin birth is not, then, a repetition or description of the *vere Deus vere homo*, although in its own way it also expresses, explains and throws light upon it.³⁶

Reacting to the intellectualizing of the issue by von Harnack, Schleiermacher, and

³²Barth, CD I/2, 170.

³³Barth, CD I/2, 171.

³⁴Barth, CD I/2, 173.

³⁵It was "a certain inward, essential rightness and importance in their connexion with the person of Jesus Christ first admitted them [i.e., the natal texts] to a share in the Gospel witness" (Barth, CD I/2, 176).

³⁶Barth, CD I/2, 177.

Althaus, Barth is especially disappointed in Brunner's treatment of the doctrine.³⁷

Having cleared the ground with these preliminary remarks, Barth develops his positive presentation under two subsections. In the first subsection, Barth examines the phrase natus ex Maria virgine, which, while the lessor of the two, interprets the latter phrase, conceptus de Spiritu sancto. Jesus Christ is man

in a different way from the other sons of other mothers. But the difference under consideration here is so great, so fundamental and comprehensive, that it does not impair the completeness and genuineness of His humanity.³⁸

But what does the ex virgine mean? Barth succinctly declares:

By the *ex virgine* the essential point is plainly expressed that by the Word being made flesh, by God's Son assuming "human nature," this human nature undergoes a very definite limitation. Grace is imparted to it. But this cannot happen without its coming under judgment as well.³⁹

Thus, since this "human nature" has

of itself no capacity for being adopted by God's Word into unity with Himself, a mystery must be wrought in order that this may be made possible. And this mystery must consist in its receiving the capacity for God which it does not

³⁷Barth, CD I/2, 177-184. In The Mediator, Brunner develops what Barth calls "the queer objection" to the virgin birth, namely that it involves "biological inquisitiveness" (Barth, CD I/2, 183).

³⁸Barth, CD I/2, 185. Barth is here highlighting the first half of the phrase, natus ex Maria. Barth notes: "Man is not there only in a supplementary capacity. In his own place, his own sharply defined manner, he participates in the event as one of the principles; not as a cipher or as a phantom, but as the real man that he is" (Barth, CD I/2, 186).

³⁹Barth, CD I/2, 187. Note Barth distances himself from abstract concepts of human nature by using quotation marks. During this same period, he uses a similar technique in his Gifford Lectures when dealing with "natural theology" (Karl Barth, The Knowledge of God and the Service of God According to the Teaching of the Reformation: Recalling the Scottish Confession of 1560, being the Gifford Lectures delivered in the University of Aberdeen in 1937 and 1938, trans. J. L. M. Haire and Ian Henderson [London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938], 6).

possess. This mystery is signified by the *natus ex virgine*.⁴⁰

While not causally connected with the virgin birth, original sin does not touch the incarnate one, because he "does not live out the sin":

This human nature is limited and contradicted by the *natus ex virgine*. It indicates the existence of a Man who as a man like all of us in this sinful nature of ours, in the flesh, bears with us the way and the curse of sin, but who as God does not live out the sin, because even now He does not live it, because the *servum arbitrium* of disobedience is foreign to Him while the *liberum arbitrium* of obedience is His own.⁴¹

Although the virgin birth takes place without sexual intercourse, neither the absence of a sex act nor the presence of virginity is the sign in question. What then is the sign?

Thus His begetting by a human father could not be the sign of the existence of the man Jesus alone as the Son begotten of the Father in eternity. . . . A sign which really describes the mystery of *enhypostasis* must then consist in the actual elimination of the other sign, and so in the lack of a human father, i.e., *natus ex virgine*.⁴²

Thus, the absence of the male is the sign of the presence of the Lord.

The second and final subsection of § 15.3 highlights the role of the Holy Spirit as the ground and content of the Christ event.

It is this freedom of the Holy Spirit and in the Holy Spirit that is already involved in the incarnation of the Word of God, in the assumption of human nature by the Son of God, in which we have to recognize the real ground of the freedom of the children of God, the real ground of all conception of revelation,

⁴⁰Barth, CD I/2, 188-189.

⁴¹Barth, CD I/2, 189. Barth stresses the virgin birth as a sign over against the objections of Schleiermacher, Seeberg, Brunner, and Althaus, who question its cogency for explaining Christ's sinlessness (Barth, CD I/2, 189-190).

⁴²Barth, CD I/2, 193. Note that at the end of this small-print note Barth indirectly invokes the non-assumptus from Gregory Nazianzus to prove Mary had original sin (Barth, CD I/2, 195-196).

all lordship of grace over man, the real ground of the Church.⁴³

Thus, the Holy Spirit is central to and, one might even argue, the apex of, Barth's presentation of the miracle of Christmas:

Here, then, at this fontal point in revelation, the Word of God is not without the Spirit of God. And here already there is the togetherness of Spirit and Word. Through the Spirit it becomes really possible for the creature, for man, to be there and to be free for God. Through the Spirit flesh, human nature, is assumed into unity with the Son of God. Through the Spirit this Man can be God's Son and at the same time the Second Adam and as such "the firstborn among many brethren" (Rom. 8²⁹), the prototype of all who are set free for His sake and through faith in Him. And in Him human nature is made the bearer of revelation, so in us it is made the recipient of it, not by its own power, but by the power conferred on it by the Spirit, who according to 2 Cor. 3¹⁷ is Himself the Lord.⁴⁴

Thus, the Holy Spirit is "a more precise determination of the sign of the Virgin birth" than merely the absence of the male.⁴⁵ This sign roots for us the secret of the Christ event in the secret of God himself and grounds our hope "that the same work, the same preparation of man for God by God Himself, can happen to us also" ⁴⁶

And because He is thus conceived and born, He has to be recognized and acknowledged as the One He is and in the mystery in which He is the One He is. . . . The mystery does not rest upon the miracle. The miracle rests upon the mystery.⁴⁷

⁴³Barth, CD I/2, 199.

⁴⁴Barth, CD I/2, 199.

⁴⁵Barth, CD I/2, 199.

⁴⁶Barth, CD I/2, 199-200. Barth also rejects the idea that the Spirit "does what the male does" in the conceptus de Spiritu sancto or that it is "in any way analogous to the effects of creaturely *eros*." Instead, Barth endorses John of Damascus' adage that Mary conceived through her ear (Barth, CD I/2, 200-201).

⁴⁷Barth, CD I/2, 202.

Reflections Upon the Mystery and Miracle

Barth's discussion of the Holy Spirit as the ground of the Christ event is greatly magnified in importance by the startling treatment of "flesh" that comes before it, most specifically Barth's doctrine of Christ's fallen humanity. But to fully appreciate this innovative theme in Barth, we should not overlook its historical context.

Barth's 1925 Münster and 1933 Bonn lectures on John 1:14 are quite important to a proper understanding of § 15.2.⁴⁸ The three definitions of "flesh" used in § 15.2.II--including the one on which Barth's doctrine of fallen humanity is based--are lifted directly out of his earlier lectures.⁴⁹ While he references several theologians in the Church Dogmatics who share some concept of Christ's fallen humanity, in the formative Münster/Bonn lectures, Barth draws material from only one, Hermann Bezzel.⁵⁰

⁴⁸This is hinted at by the translator, who was clearly eager to publish this volume to expose "the emptiness of the objection sometimes raised against the *Dogmatics* that Barth impugns the sinless perfection of the Son" (G. W. Bromiley, Translator's Preface, Witness to the Word by Karl Barth, vii).

⁴⁹Barth defines "flesh" as animal flesh, neutral humanity, and fallen flesh in its hostile opposition to God. Compare Barth, CD I/2, 147-155; and Barth, Witness to the Word, 87-90. Much of Barth's treatments of § 15.2.I and § 15.2.III are also drawn from his earlier formulations in Barth, Witness to the Word, 85 and 90-93.

⁵⁰A compendium of Bezzel's statements on theology had just been published in the year Barth first gave these lectures (see Johannes Rupprecht, Hermann Bezzel als Theologe [München: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1925]). Barth's personal interest in the volume is noteworthy: Rupprecht conspicuously praises Barth's theology at the beginning and end of the book, leaving the reader with the impression that it was his interest in Barth's theology that prompted publication of the volume on Bezzel. Rupprecht suggests that theology would be well served by balancing Barth's fine emphasis upon the transcendence of God with Bezzel's stress on the affinity of Christ's humiliation with man's sinful state (Rupprecht, 2, 341). In addition to Bezzel, Barth lists in the Church Dogmatics five other theologians chronologically: Gottfried Menken, Edward Irving, J. C. K. von Hofmann, H. F. Kohlbrügge, and Edward Bohl

Bezzel stresses that the Word, rather than merely becoming neutral man

(Menschwerdung), became fallen flesh (Fleischwerdung),

the form of manhood dishonored and devalued by sin, the form into which sin has long and fiercely thrust its sting and on which the world has stamped its awesome memories, the form oftentimes so utterly unlike a man, so deformed and worthless and unconsecrated.⁵¹

Bezzel's main point is to highlight struggle in the inner life of Christ. Thus, Barth himself follows Rupprecht's suggestion, balancing his own emphasis on God's transcendence with Bezzel's stress on the continuity between sinful man and the incarnate Christ. The object of Barth's rhetoric and resulting polemic on this doctrine is Lutheran scholastic theology.⁵²

(Barth, CD I/2, 154-155). Menken, von Hofman, and Bezzel were all part of the Erlangen School of radical kenoticism, while Bohl and his father-in-law, Kohlbrügge, who clashed sharply with Abraham Kuyper, were well known to Barth. It is doubtful that Barth ever read Irving, knowing him only through H. R. Mackintosh. These theologians appear to have been influenced through a number of mediating figures by the original insights of Flemish mystic Antoinette Bourignon (Needham, 475-476; F. Ernest Stoeffler, German Pietism During the Eighteenth Century, in Studies in the History of Religions [Supplements to Numen], vol. 24 [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973], 172-246; Johnson, 137-167; Busch, 142; Barth, CD I/2, 154). Barth does not so much endorse the theology of any of these six, as say they had fired "certain sorties" in the controversial direction he intends to go. Barth appeals to these examples because in pressing this theme he clearly understands that the weight of church opinion stands against him, including "[a]ll earlier theology, up to and including the Reformers and their successors . . ." (Barth, CD I/2, 153).

⁵¹Barth, CD I/2, 155. All of Barth's citations from Bezzel in both the lectures and the Church Dogmatics come from Rupprecht, 61-63.

⁵²With his fallen humanity doctrine, Barth is clearly opposing traditional Lutheran theologians, such as Hollaz, who taught Christ's human nature was supremely healthy, immortal, and lovely (Barth, CD I/2, 153). This had long been a polemic concern of Barth's: "The Lutherans thought it necessary to stress that the sanctification means that Christ's human nature will have a supreme elegance and beauty of form--the Lutheran Christ is a handsome man--whereas the Reformed set no store by that and regarded the human nature as equivalent to a servant form" (Karl Barth, The Göttingen Dogmatics: Instruction in the Christian Religion, vol. 1, ed. Hannelotte Reiffen, trans. Geoffrey W.

An error in the authorized English translation of the Church Dogmatics at the beginning of § 15.2 obscures another source behind Barth's doctrine of Christ's fallen humanity.⁵³ From the German original, it is clear that the work of Barth's friend and theological antagonist, Heinrich Vogel, is germane to the whole of § 15.2, not merely § 15.2.I.⁵⁴

Instead of stressing the continuity between fallen man and the incarnate Christ, Vogel emphasizes the opposite:

Menschliche Ideologie möchte wohl die volle und ganze Solidarität darin erblicken, daß es in der Fleischwerdung des Wortes um ein Sünder-werden-wie-wir ginge, um eine Versuchbarkeit des Erlösers, die in einer Einwilligung in die Sucht des Fleisches ihren Ursprung hätte,--aber die göttliche Solidarität mit

Bromiley [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991], 166). Could not Barth also be dealing a blow to more modern theologies, from Schleiermacher to Ullmann, and above all, Wilhelm Herrmann? Barth's fallen humanity doctrine leaves Herrmann's emphasis on revelatory force of the ethical "inner life" of Jesus with little ground on which to stand. For Ullmann's list of "enthusiasts" holding to a fallen humanity doctrine, some of whom Barth mentions, see Bruce, 255, n. 2. On Herrmann, see Wilhelm Herrmann, The Communion of the Christian with God: Described on the Basis of Luther's Statements, ed. R. W. Stewart, trans. J. Sandys Stanyon, third English edition (London: Williams & Norgate, 1909), 101-105; and Pannenberg, Jesus--God and Man, 359-360.

⁵³After a two-sentence, large-print opening and its accompanying one sentence small-print note, Barth divides § 15.2 into three subsections, each delineated by a Roman numeral. In the translation, the note has been misplaced below the first Roman numeral instead of above it, implying falsely that it applies only to § 15.2.I. The note in question reads: "For what follows cf. Heinrich Vogel, *Das Wort ward Fleisch: Ein Kapitel aus der Christologie*, 1936." Compare Barth, CD I/2, 132; and Karl Barth, Die Kirchliche Dogmatik I/2 (Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1945), 145.

⁵⁴Heinrich Vogel was a Lutheran pastor and later a theologian at Humboldt-Universität in Berlin who Barth liked "'not least because I can pull his leg', but above all, of course, because he was so perceptive a fighter" (Eberhard Busch, Karl Barth: His Life from Letters and Autobiographical Texts, trans. John Bowden [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976], 249). The particular work in question is Heinrich Vogel, Das Wort ward Fleisch: Ein Kapitel aus der Christologie (München: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1936).

dem Sünder, die in der Fleischwerdung des Wortes verkündet wird, die göttliche Gnade und Wahrheit, die in dieser Offenbarung der Herrlichkeit des eingeborenen Sohnes beschlossen ist, ist gerade dadurch gekennzeichnet, daß der heilige Gottes zur Sünde gemacht wurde ohne zu sündigen. Diesen Sachverhalt bezeugte denn das Dogma der Kirche, wenn es lehrte, daß der von Maria der Jungfrau Geborene ohne die Erbsünde des gefallenen Menschengeschlechts geboren sei.⁵⁵

Barth's later comments on Vogel are also pertinent here:

Heinrich Vogel says that the human nature taken by Christ was a "holy" flesh. I say no. It was *our* flesh, but if Christ takes on our flesh, then a sanctification of the flesh takes place, and then the man in Christ cannot sin. But the sinlessness of Christ is a *deed*, not a quality.⁵⁶

But Barth is not just in polemic against Vogel. His fourth and final comment on

"flesh" in § 15.2.II, which we previously noted stresses the discontinuity of Christ's flesh with ours, is clearly indebted to Vogel.⁵⁷ Thus, in § 15.2, Barth holds together

⁵⁵Vogel, Das Wort ward Fleisch, 35. ET: "Human ideology would obviously like to see the full and complete solidarity in that the incarnation of the word had to do with becoming a sinner like us, with the temptability of the redeemer, which had its origin in a consent to the desires of the flesh, but the divine solidarity with the sinner, which is proclaimed in the incarnation of the Word, the divine grace and truth, which is established in the revelation of the only begotten Son, is marked by the fact that the holy God became sin without sinning. These facts are attested by the dogma of the church, when it taught that the one born of the Virgin Mary was born without the inherited sin of fallen mankind."

⁵⁶Karl Barth, Karl Barth's Table Talk, ed. and trans. John D. Godsey, Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Paper, no. 10 (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1963), 68. Barth goes on: "Temptation was very real for Jesus, but a temptation that could not be followed by a new 'Fall', because now God has chosen to be man. The repetition of Genesis 3 is impossible. Nevertheless, the reality of a sanctified life was a *fight*, not just a being. Jesus had *to obey*. But it was a fight that could not have another result" (Barth, Table Talk, 69). For more on this holy flesh of Christ teaching, see Heinrich Vogel, Gott in Christo: Ein Erkenntnisgang durch die Grundprobleme der Dogmatik (Berlin: Lettner Verlag, 1951), 665-666.

⁵⁷Compare Barth, CD I/2, 155-156; and Vogel, Das Wort ward Fleisch, 35: "Das gerade ist das tröstliche Geheimnis im Geheimnis, daß er wohl zur Sünde für uns gemacht wurde, daß er wohl an die Stelle des Sünders trat, aber eben nicht selbst ein Sünder wurde. Das ist das Paradox dieser Stellvertretung: eben indem er nicht ein

the opposite emphases of Bezzel and Vogel.

But how is this creative combination of concepts possible? On what basis can Barth hold them both? Barth gives us the answer in § 15.3 in his treatment of the ancient dogma of the anhypostasis and enhypostasis of Christ's human nature. We noted in Chapter 1 the importance of this doctrine in Barth's theology of revelation, recently made clear by Bruce McCormack's seminal study on the topic.⁵⁸ What we did not note was the theological context in which this dogma was first developed by Barth:

The incarnation consists in the assumption of a human nature by the eternal Son. The "*assumptio*" did not entail any alteration in the divine nature of the Son. What it meant was that, without surrendering anything proper to Himself as divine, the Son took on a "*human* mode of existence". The *kenosis* of the Son was thus understood by Barth to be a positive rather than a negative act; a *kenosis* by addition, not by subtraction. . . . Likewise, the human nature assumed is not altered through its assumption. The union of the Logos with the human nature was understood by Barth to entail no divinization of the human. What is in view is a "unity in differentiation", "a strictly dialectical union", which in no way sets aside the qualitative distinction between divine nature and human nature.⁵⁹

Sünder wurde, trat er an die Stelle der Sünder. Wäre er ein Sünder geworden, so hätte er nimmermehr an die Stelle der Sünder treten können. . . . Wiederum bezeugte das kirchliche Dogma eben in dem Bekenntnissatz: Geboren aus Maria der Jungfrau, das göttliche Geheimnis und Wunder des Offenbarungsaktes, in dem der λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο." ET: "That is exactly the comforting secret within a secret, that he was made sin for us, that he stood in the place of the sinner, but didn't himself become a sinner. That is the paradox of this representative, in that he didn't become a sinner, he stood in the place of the sinner. If he had become a sinner, he would never again have been able to stand in the place of the sinner. . . . Again the church dogma attests in the sentence of the confession: 'Born of the Virgin Mary, the divine secret and miracle of the act of revelation, in that the Logos became flesh.'"

⁵⁸McCormack, Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology, 361-367.

⁵⁹McCormack, Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology, 361. McCormack immediately continues: "It is at this point that Barth introduced the ancient dogma of the *anhypostasia* and *enhypostasia* of the human nature of Christ" (McCormack, Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology, 361). One significant aspect of McCormack's study, which makes it so valuable, is his unfolding

While Barth's methodology in holding the opposite emphases of Bezzel and Vogel is dialectic, and while the anhypostatic-enhypostatic model highlights the differentiation between God and humankind, providing some rationale for the method employed, it does not explain his understanding of the hypostatic union. What is Barth's fuller theological rationale for the union?

In his earliest polemic against the Lutheran unio naturarum, Barth shows his hand.⁶⁰ Following Heppe, Barth presents the three simultaneous acts of the Holy Spirit in the incarnation: the formation, the sanctification, and the assumption.⁶¹ Barth focuses most upon the act of sanctification by the Spirit of the seed of Mary, following the Reformed emphasis upon the forensic nature of this sanctification rather than the Lutheran more substantialist view:

The second and greater side of the miracle is sanctification. This particle of human nature, of the nature of Adam, is separated from the mass of flesh by the power of the Spirit (*hagiasmos*), and by divine pronouncement, forensically, the sin of Adam is not imputed to it. . . . The Lutherans thought it necessary to stress that the sanctification means that Christ's human nature will have supreme elegance and beauty of form--the Lutheran Christ is a handsome man--whereas the Reformed set no store by that and regarded the human nature as equivalent to a servant form.⁶²

of the continuing dialectic strands in Barth's theology, overturning the school of interpretation that sought to identify the point at which Barth turned away from dialectic to analogy. Barth's development of the doctrine of anhypostasis-enhypostasis is pivotal in that story. The need for such a study of the continuing dialectic in Barth was pointed up by Stuart D. McLean, Humanity in the Thought of Karl Barth (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1981), 12.

⁶⁰Barth, Göttingen Dogmatics, vol. 1, 166-167.

⁶¹Heppe, 424-429. Heppe specifically highlights the views of Johannes Henricus Heidegger's Corpus Theologiae (1700), quoted in Chapter 1.

⁶²Barth, Göttingen Dogmatics, vol. 1, 166.

This anti-Lutheran polemic also animated Barth's presentation of his fallen humanity doctrine.

Behind these older doctrines of the sanctification of Mary's seed lay the thorny issue of original sin. The Lutheran scholastics taught the physical inheritance of original sin, whereas at the best of times the Reformed had a place for its imputation. Since original sin was inherited, the corresponding Lutheran emphasis in the hypostatic union--designed to deal with its transmission in the case of Christ--was also rather physical, centering upon the effect of an immediate union with the divine nature on Christ's flesh. On the other hand, the Reformed scholastics, stressing that the union between the two natures was mediated by the divine person of Christ, turned to the mere non-imputation of original sin to explain its absence in his case.

The Reformed apparently never reconciled their less well-developed doctrine of the nature of original sin with their innovative view of its forensic transmission. Their own notion of the nature of original sin, like that of their Lutheran counterparts, remained strongly substantialist or essentialist. They clung to older notions of original sin as a contagion or disease. Barth, however, reconstructs his view of original sin in light of its transmission.⁶³

McCormack notes that it was Barth's "actualistic" ontology that made this development possible:

Barth did not understand human nature in substantialist terms. He understood "nature" to be a function of decision and act. The Logos, for Barth, elected

⁶³Barth, CD IV, 509-513; Bruce L. McCormack, "For Us and For Our Salvation: Incarnation and Atonement in the Reformed Tradition," Studies in Reformed Theology and History 1 (1993): 20-22; McCormack, Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology, 362-365.

Himself to stand in our place, to make Himself liable for human sin. That is what is meant by the assumption of "fallen human nature."⁶⁴

This feature of Barth's theology has been recently and insightfully catalogued and analyzed in detail by George Hunsinger:

Actualism is the most distinctive and perhaps the most difficult of the motifs. It is present whenever Barth speaks, as he constantly does, in the language of occurrence, happening, event, history, decisions, and act. At the most general level it means that he thinks primarily in terms of events and relationships rather than monadic or self-contained substances. So pervasive is this motif that Barth's whole theology might well be described as a theology of active relations. God and humanity are both defined in fundamentally actualistic terms. . . . Positively, therefore, our relationship to God must be understood in active, historical terms, and it must be a relationship given to us strictly from the outside.⁶⁵

Thus, in light of Barth's actualist ontology, we can better appreciate his treatment of the sanctification of Christ's fallen human nature:

⁶⁴McCormack, "For Us and For Our Salvation," 21-22. On this important feature in Barth's theology, see Pannenberg, Jesus--God and Man, 341-342; McPake, 374-375, n. 73; and Colyer, 293.

⁶⁵Hunsinger, How to Read Karl Barth, 30-31. Even Hunsinger's earlier observations in a more political context are not incongruous with his later, more careful judgment: "When Barth speaks of 'humanity,' he uses the term in a sense that is realist rather than idealist, social rather than individual, political rather than ontological. In other words, Barth uses the term as concretely as possible. When he speaks of the 'humanity of Jesus Christ,' he is thinking of that humanity in the concrete, realist sense so that by implication the significance of Christ's humanity is equally realist and concrete: political, social, and historical" (George Hunsinger, ed. and trans., Karl Barth and Radical Politics [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976], 137, n. 8). On the context of these comments--the Marquardt-Diem debate on Barth's christology and politics--see Friedrich-Wilhelm Marquardt, "Socialism in the Theology of Karl Barth," in Karl Barth and Radical Politics, 47-76; Hermann Diem, "Karl Barth as a Socialist: Controversy Over a New Attempt to Understand Him," in Karl Barth and Radical Politics, 121-138; Markus Barth, "Current Discussion on the Political Character of Karl Barth's Theology," in Footnotes to a Theology: The Karl Barth Colloquium of 1972, ed. Martin Rumscheidt (Canada: Corporation for the Publication of Academic Studies in Religion in Canada, 1974), 77-94; and John Thompson, Christ in Perspective: Christological Perspectives in the Theology of Karl Barth (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 148-149.

The "sanctification" of human nature that results is not to be likened to a cleansing or healing of a disease; it is rather the function of the decision by which the Son of God chooses not to do what we do and to do what we choose not to do.⁶⁶

On this actualistic basis, the sanctification extends beyond the virginal conception:

The hypostatic union was therefore understood by Barth not to have taken place in a single moment, in the conception perhaps, but as taking place, moment by moment, in that the Logos continuously wills to assume the human nature. The effect of this view is to place the *communio naturarum* in a very pale light. Does this mean that the antithesis between God and humankind is not overcome? No; it simply means that it is not overcome *in the human nature*, as the Lutherans would have it through their interpretation of the *communio naturarum*. The antithesis is overcome in the *Person of the union*, through the real predication to Him of the sin, guilt, and punishment of humankind.⁶⁷

And, thus, Barth's actualism supports his understanding of the anhypostasis and enhypostasis of Christ's human nature:

And in suffering this punishment, He overcomes the antithesis. But the overcoming of the antithesis in the Person of the Logos in no way sets aside the antithesis on the level of the relationship of the natures. Divine attributes and operations cannot be predicated of the human nature. Though Barth does not offer a thorough explanation of why this should be, the reason seems clear enough: attributes and operations may only properly be predicated of persons or subjects. But there is no human subject here to whom divine attributes and operations might be attributed. The only Subject here is the second Person of the Trinity.⁶⁸

This understanding explains the evidence we have already noted in § 15, as well as material beyond the scope of our limiting strategy.⁶⁹ By Kehm's argument for the

⁶⁶McCormack, "For Us and For Our Salvation," 21.

⁶⁷McCormack, Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectic Theology, 365.

⁶⁸McCormack, Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectic Theology, 365-366.

⁶⁹Barth, Göttingen Dogmatics, vol. 1, 166-167; Barth, CD I/2, 155-156; Barth, CD IV/1, 101, 510-513; Barth, CD IV/2, 27, 49-50, 59-60, 88, 92; and Barth, CD IV/3.2, 550. Two short studies not included in the Church Dogmatics also indicate this

appearance of an essentialist strand later in Church Dogmatics III/2, we are left unmoved.⁷⁰

The Goal of Vocation

Having considered in some detail the mystery and miracle of Christmas, we are now in a position to more fully appreciate the portion of Barth's writings which, as we saw, Bromiley identifies as his "fine treatment" of union with Christ. Barth does not place our favorite doctrine early in his dogmatic presentation. On the contrary, it comes late in his presentation of the doctrine of reconciliation at § 71.3 in the section titled "The Goal of Vocation." In the two sections of § 71 "The Vocation of Man"

approach: Karl Barth, "The Humanity of God," in The Humanity of God, trans. John Newton Thomas and Thomas Wieser (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1960), 47; Karl Barth, Christ and Adam: Man and Humanity in Romans 5, trans. T. A. Smail, in Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers, no. 5 (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1956), 41-42. In this latter case, care must be taken, as the English version is more a paraphrase than a translation, precisely at the point of our concern, apparently using essentialist language to translate actualistic concepts. See Hunsinger, Karl Barth and Radical Politics, 136, n. 6; Karl Barth, "Christus und Adam nach Römer 5," Theologische Studien, n. 5 [Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag A. G. Zollikon, 1952], 50-51.) This translation was the first major work by Karl Barth published by the Scottish Journal of Theology, preceeded only by Karl Barth, "The Real Church," Scottish Journal of Theology 3 (1950): 337-351. Ironically, note the editors' purpose in bringing the work to the public: "Here is a penetrating account of the Biblical and Christian doctrine of man in the light of the saving humanity of Christ, in which Barth at the same time shows the profound unity of redemption and creation and reveals the foundation of the Christian life and Church in the human nature of the Son of God" (T. F. Torrance and J. K. S. Reid, Editors' Foreword, in Christ and Adam by Karl Barth, i). On the status of this work in Barth's corpus, see Busch, 347-350, 389.

⁷⁰George Kehm argues for the appearance of an essentialist ontology later in Barth's career, in contrast "to his earlier purely actualistic conception of man" (George Harry Kehm, "The Christological Foundation of Anthropology in the Theology of Karl Barth," [Th.D. diss., Harvard Univ., 1966], 196). Kehm posits that this becomes an essentialist strand in Barth's thought (Kehm, 191, 297). Compare Barth, CD III/2, 219ff, and Barth, CD IV/2, 27.

which precede it, Barth prepares the reader for the lofty peak he will reach when considering union with Christ.

Stressing again the uniqueness of Christ's person and work, Barth notes in § 71.1 that election is the basis of vocation.⁷¹ This will and decision of God for men--the "*de iure*" status we enjoy in his eyes--is an alteration of the situation of all men.⁷² On the one hand, all must, therefore, be treated with the openness and tolerance deserved, while on the other hand a responsibility to respond befalls them in utmost seriousness.⁷³ As an event, this personal calling of God is renewed constantly.⁷⁴

In § 71.2, "The Event of Vocation," Barth expands upon the last point in the previous section, stressing that the Holy Spirit who brings this event is not independent but is Christ's Spirit.⁷⁵ No ordo salutis or stress on human experiences is allowed.⁷⁶ Instead, illumination is the process of vocation, and calling is its form.⁷⁷ Baptism is the proper expression of vocation.⁷⁸

Homo Christianus

What, then, is the goal of vocation? Barth immediately gives his majestic

⁷¹Barth, CD IV/3.2, 484.

⁷²Barth, CD IV/3.2, 491.

⁷³Barth, CD IV/3.2, 493-495.

⁷⁴Barth, CD IV/3.2, 496-497.

⁷⁵Barth, CD IV/3.2, 502-503.

⁷⁶Barth, CD IV/3.2, 505-507.

⁷⁷Barth, CD IV/3.2, 508, 514-515.

⁷⁸Barth, CD IV/3.2, 517.

answer:

The purpose of a man's vocation is that he should become a Christian, a *homo christianus*. In this event it is thus a question of the creation of the Christian and then, in the sense of a *creatio continua*, of his preservation and nurture. Whatever may have to be said in the matter can consist only in a series of elucidations of the simplest answer. But it certainly stands in need of radical explanation.⁷⁹

In the thirty some pages which follow, Barth does not fail in his task.

The birth of a believer is no less than the mystery and miracle of Christmas: the miracle of calling denotes the mystery of vocation.⁸⁰ Christ's free decision is not a prisoner to the cultural trappings of "the *corpus christianum*," but rather "the liberating power of His Word," which is "lordly power in which a man is set in attachment to Him."⁸¹

When He calls, He thus calls with power. For in this confidence in which there is no anxiety, He calls with liberating and creative force, summoning non-being into being, giving Himself unreservedly to the one whom He calls, delivering Himself up to him, really calling him to Himself, enabling him to hear and obey self-evidently and without argument like the first disciples, and on no other basis than the obviously all-sufficient basis of His call. This call of His: "Come unto me," awakens man to a faith in Him as by it He makes Himself known.⁸²

This does not mean that believers become deified or lose their solidarity with their fellow human beings. They even still sin. The believer's

distinction from others is definitely not grounded in himself, not put in his own hands, let alone made over to him as a possession and as it were placed in his pocket. . . . [T]he Christian, as a child of light, is a child of God who is Himself

⁷⁹Barth, CD IV/3.2, 521.

⁸⁰Barth, CD IV/3.2, 521.

⁸¹Barth, CD IV/3.2, 524, 529.

⁸²Barth, CD IV/3.2, 530.

light.⁸³

To whom does this apply? Barth answers:

Now we desire that this truth should apply to all men. There can be no doubt that it ought to do so. We hope that it finally will. But it cannot be said to apply to all men unless we arbitrarily wrest it.⁸⁴

Christians, therefore, as the sons and daughters of God, exist "in particular proximity to Him and therefore in analogy to what He is."⁸⁵ What does this mean for Barth? "And in analogy and correspondence, which means with real similarity for all the dissimilarity, they may become sons of God."⁸⁶ The believer's divine sonship is, thus, as real as Christ's own.

The homo christianus is elected to fellowship and discipleship. However, Barth notes with stark realism:

But it is one thing to be elected for it and another to be set in it. The latter is the distinctive thing which takes place in the calling of man and makes him a Christian. As certainly as this calling aims at his becoming and being a child of God, its goal is very simply but powerfully his fellowship with its source, i.e., with the One who calls him.⁸⁷

Biblically, this fellowship is

a relationship between two persons in which these are brought into perfect mutual co-ordination within the framework of a definite order, yet with no destruction of their two-sided identity and particularity, but rather in its confirmation and expression. We have such a relationship, such fellowship and therefore mutual co-ordination, in unique perfection in the relationship of man

⁸³Barth, CD IV/3.2, 531-532.

⁸⁴Barth, CD IV/3.2, 532. Here Barth goes on to say: "No one is by nature, nor has the power to be, what Christians are."

⁸⁵Barth, CD IV/3.2, 532.

⁸⁶Barth, CD IV/3.2, 533.

⁸⁷Barth, CD IV/3.2, 535.

to Jesus Christ in which he is set when his vocation takes place.⁸⁸

How is this accomplished? Only by the gift and work of the Holy Spirit.⁸⁹

Unio Cum Christo

Rejecting the terminology of unio mystica, Barth identifies the goal of vocation as union with Christ:

Having made this point, we may now proceed to state that the fellowship of Christians with Christ, which is the goal of vocation, is a perfect fellowship inasmuch as what takes place in it is no less than their union with Christ. The terms "attachment" and "coordination" are inadequate if they are not expressly understood in the sense of "union," i.e., the Christian's *unio cum Christo*.⁹⁰

In a small-print section, Barth now confesses that he should have made this his opening point in § 71.3, since it is "the heart of the matter" and "the central point": "... we really ought to have put it first."⁹¹ Why? The believer's union with Christ "supports all that proceeds and is tacitly presupposed in it."⁹²

Continuing his actualistic emphasis, Barth stresses that it is Jesus Christ "who initiates and acts decisively in this union." He is alone in his uniqueness, but "cannot and will not remain alone" in his prophetic dimension.⁹³

But as He calls them to Himself in the divine power of His Spirit, He refreshes them by offering and giving Himself to them and making them His own. That

⁸⁸Barth, CD IV/3.2, 535.

⁸⁹Barth, CD IV/3.2, 538.

⁹⁰Barth, CD IV/3.2, 540.

⁹¹Barth, CD IV/3.2, 541. Barth points out that Calvin did this in the opening of Book III of his Institutes.

⁹²Barth, CD IV/3.2, 541.

⁹³Barth, CD IV/3.2, 541.

He wills and does this is--in analogy to the mystery and miracle of Christmas--the true ratio of Christian existence as this is celebrated, adored and proclaimed within the community of Christians in the common administration of the Lord's Supper, instituted to represent the perfect fellowship between Him and them which he has established--an implication which we cannot do more than indicate in the present context.⁹⁴

For their part, believers are not "pure passivity":

What kind of vocation, illumination and awakening would it be, what kind of knowledge, if they were merely left gaping at the One who discloses Himself to them?⁹⁵

Christians are active, responding through the Spirit.

After examining the biblical theology of John and Paul, Barth moves to a linguistic analysis of "in Christ." Noting that "in" both includes and transcends local signification, Barth expounds "Christ is in the Christian" and "the Christian is in Christ." The first statement implies more than the locative: it implies the Lordship of Christ over all the man's thinking, acting, and speaking.⁹⁶ The second statement has not only a local reference, but also a "ruling and determinative principle":

Again, there is no rivalry between the human person and the divine. There is thus no danger that the former will be overwhelmed by the latter. There is no danger that it will necessarily be destroyed by it and perish. Rather, the human person, experiencing the power of the divine, and unreservedly subject to it, will necessarily recognize and honor it again and again in its sovereignty, finding itself established as a human person and set in truly human and the freest possible movement in orientation on it.⁹⁷

⁹⁴Barth, CD IV/3.2, 542.

⁹⁵Barth, CD IV/3.2, 542. On this basis, Barth rejects any hint of "an extension of the incarnation in relation to the Christian's *unio cum Christo* and then in relation to the Lord's Supper" (Barth, CD IV/3.2, 543).

⁹⁶Barth, CD IV/3.2, 547.

⁹⁷Barth, CD IV/3.2, 548.

Barth then clearly signals the end of his positive development of union with Christ, noting that his presentation has been intentionally redundant:

If, as we have attempted in concentric circles, we think through what it means that the goal of vocation, and therefore of Christianity as divine sonship, is always attachment to Christ, co-ordination and fellowship with Him, discipleship, appropriation to Him with the corresponding expropriation, life of and by the Holy Spirit, then we are infallibly led at last to the point which we have now reached and described, namely, that a man becomes and is a Christian as he unites himself with Christ and Christ with him.⁹⁸

Notice the strong synergistic stress, which highlights that the Christian is not passive but active before Christ.

With the crescendo of his lecture given, Barth reflects on the historical theology behind it. He notes that this doctrine is "open to misconception and even fraught with danger."⁹⁹ He specifically notes that Luther and the Lutherans fell into the concept of an extension of the incarnation, missing out on the end the active responsibility of man.¹⁰⁰

On the other hand, Barth credits Calvin with making a "real advance" in the doctrine of union with Christ:

The real advance has obviously been made when we come to the *Institutio* of 1559, in which *unio cum Christo* has become the common denominator under which Calvin tried to range his whole doctrine of the appropriation of the salvation achieved and revealed in Christ.¹⁰¹

Most importantly, Calvin points us towards the importance of the Holy Spirit as the

⁹⁸Barth, CD IV/3.2, 548.

⁹⁹Barth, CD IV/3.2, 549.

¹⁰⁰Barth, CD IV/3.2, 549-550.

¹⁰¹Barth, CD IV/3.2, 552.

"*vinculum*" which binds us to Christ. Barth sees Calvin's profound stress on the central importance of the Holy Spirit to union with Christ as bridging the gap between what is done for us by Christ in Book II of the Institutes and what "can apply to us and be effective for us" in Book III.¹⁰²

Without the Spirit, i.e., without what Christ Himself does to us through Him, we could only indulge in frigid and unprofitable speculation concerning Him. Through the Holy Spirit, however, He achieves the *conjunctio* between Himself and us and us and Himself.¹⁰³

However, upon closer inspection, Barth can only compliment Calvin for having attempted, not accomplished, this goal:

My only qualification would be that this is so at least in arrangement To this extent we are forced to say that in the Third Book Jesus Christ is again and most impressively the theme of Calvin from the standpoint of arrangement, but only from the standpoint of arrangement.¹⁰⁴

Barth does, however, credit Calvin and Reformed theology after him with keeping

alive the recognition that the vocation of the elect consists essentially in his *unio cum Christi*, and therefore in all its aspects is to be understood accordingly.¹⁰⁵

Reflections Upon Union with Christ

Barth has a clearly defined place for the doctrine of union with Christ in the

¹⁰²Barth, CD IV/3.2, 552.

¹⁰³Barth, CD IV/3.2, 552.

¹⁰⁴Barth, CD IV/3.2, 552-553. Barth notes that union with Christ has not materially altered Calvin's previous developments of faith, justification, sanctification, eschatology, and election. Barth goes on to speculate that this deficiency might be ultimately responsible for Schleiermacher's definition of Christianity as "a mode of believing in which everything is related to the redemption accomplished by Jesus Christ" (Barth, CD IV/3.2, 553).

¹⁰⁵Barth, CD IV/3.2, 554.

locus of vocation, where it is the goal of vocation. The foundation upon which Barth's doctrine and presentation are founded is de jure: decision, election, and actualism. While the extent of his de jure election is universal, Barth acknowledges that "in Christ" language is for believers. Jesus Christ calls the Christian to his vocation, fellowshiping with him so intimately and distinctively that the one does not merge with the other. In continuity with Calvin and the Reformed tradition, Barth stresses the place of the Holy Spirit set as the bond of union with Christ. And finally, Barth's concern that the believer be active and not passive is clear at the crescendo of § 71.3, as well as at the end, when he considers the next item of his dogmatics: witness.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁶Barth, CD IV/3.2, 554.

CHAPTER 5

CRITIQUE

It is perhaps significant that Professor Torrance's failure to distinguish clearly enough between Christ's response to God made for us and our response to Christ made for ourselves, goes alongside a wider failure to distinguish clearly enough between the work of the Spirit and the work of Christ. . . . Where that distinction is not made, it is easy to yield to the tendency to overemphasise Christ's work for us at the expense of the Spirit's work in us that we have discerned in Torrance. Thomas Smail, The Giving Gift: The Holy Spirit in Person, 111.

Smail's critique seems to reflect a lack of concern for the ontological reality of salvation. My "yes" to God becomes only "the result and consequences" of Christ's "yes" to the Father, rather than participating by faith in the Spirit, in Christ's own "yes". Smail misreads Torrance when he says that the latter does not have a place for my individual human response. Christian D. Kettler, The Vicarious Humanity of Christ and the Reality of Salvation, 139-140.

With our study of the genetic development of Torrance's christology and teaching on carnal union with Christ complete, and with our survey of the doctrine of union with Christ in Athanasius, Calvin, and Barth now concluded, our remaining task is to interrelate the theological concepts we have found. This exercise is inescapably critical, but such incisive reflection also holds the happy promise of not only casting more light on Torrance's own theology but also going some way towards securing a fuller appreciation of his place in Scottish theology. Thus, our critique will be both respectful and resolute.

Athanasius on Union with Christ

As seen in our survey of Athanasius, his doctrine of union with Christ appears

to be developing, not completed. Torrance finds in the church father, as is not unusual for innovative thinkers, several key themes that are fertile when planted in the field of his own growing theology. In the case of the non-assumptus, it appears that Athanasius provides a helpful category or vehicle of thought around which crystallize a number of previously developed themes in Torrance's theology. Obviously, this leaves Torrance open to the charge that perhaps Athanasius would not recognize what he has done with the ideas.¹ Given Torrance's predominately dogmatic rather than patristic studies interest in Athanasius, this is not particularly surprising.²

Nor indeed is it inescapably culpable for Torrance to make his own dogmatic use of Athanasian theological themes: he is doing theology! These themes are important to Torrance's own development of theology as well as to the history of Christian thought, and thus, they must be respected and valued in their own right. Certainly Torrance's own theology has been greatly enriched by this fertile interplay.³

¹"This may be overstated, but it seems that Athanasius becomes on occasion, something of a mouthpiece for a particular view of God and the world that may not be fully his own" (John D. Morrison, review of Trinitarian Faith by T. F. Torrance, in Calvin Theological Journal 25 [1990]: 121). "Did the Nicene Fathers articulate for themselves the problems of time and space in contrast with Greek ideas in quite this same self-conscious manner?" (Colin Brown, review of Space, Time and Incarnation by T. F. Torrance, in The Churchman 85 [1971]: 219).

²Torrance's proclivity for handling Athanasius in this manner has been previously noted: "A final anxiety: despite the massive number of references to patristic authors, there are very few quotations in the book. Torrance tends to proceed (as in other works) by paraphrase, leaving the reader unable to judge the appropriateness of his exposition without exhaustive work on the same primary texts. Given the very strong convictions which Torrance brings to the material, this is especially regrettable" (John Webster, review of The Trinitarian Faith by T. F. Torrance, Themelios 16 [1990]: 32).

³Perhaps Thomas Smail has said it best: "It shows once again how the reformed and Barthian orientation of the early Torrance has been enriched and deepened as he has gone to school with Athanasius" (Thomas Smail, review of The Mediation of Christ by

However, just because these themes must be respected, so too must the cogency of their use be judged.

The historical questions surrounding Torrance's Athanasian interpretation cannot be ignored. From reading Torrance, one would hardly even know there was a debate among patristics scholars about Athanasius, his corpus, or his theology.⁴ While this does lend something of a timeless quality to Torrance's treatment, the price paid is high.⁵ Thus, the way ahead for Torrance and those influenced by him is through, not

T. F. Torrance, in Scottish Journal of Theology 38 [1985]: 242-243). However, based on the written record we have examined, especially the unpublished materials, McPake's conjecture of a later dating for the period of the most profound Athanasian influence on Torrance appears to be most likely. We could locate only four references to Athanasius in each set of Torrance's Auburn Seminary and New College lectures. See Appendix 3.

⁴Wiles notes that the non-assumptus "must have seemed much more convincing to people who thought naturally in terms of the Hebraic conception of a real solidarity of all mankind in Adam or who were thorough-going Platonists (I put that sentence in the past tense to show that I am doubtful whether there are any such people at least in the Western world today)" (M. F. Wiles, "The Unassumed is the Unhealed," Religious Studies 4 [1968]: 53). Macquarrie notes the same for anhypostasia and enhypostasia (Macquarrie, 1). But, in spite of the fact that these themes are central to his dogmatic program, Torrance more disagrees with such opinions than directly engages them on their own historic terms, only rarely citing secondary sources. While Athanasius' Platonic context might have freed him from detailed articulation of the link between Christ and humankind, we live in a different world. After Hastings Rashdall's charge of "bastard Platonism," no theologian can afford not to engage. See Sturch, The Word and the Christ, 34.

⁵"In sum: this book is an exhilarating read, and the seriousness with which it treats Christian orthodoxy is exemplary. But readers should beware of generalization, over-confident assertion, and an historical attitude which borders on the cavalier" (John Webster, review of The Trinitarian Faith by T. F. Torrance, Themelios 16 [1990]: 32). See also David F. Ford, review of Trinitarian Faith by T. F. Torrance, in Scottish Journal of Theology, 43 (1990): 266; and David A. Scott, review of Trinitarian Faith by T. F. Torrance, in Anglican Theological Review 73 (1991): 216.

around, modern patristics and historical studies.⁶ This is especially the case for Torrance's treatment of Athanasius, now that his repeated exposure and potential indebtedness to a rare secondary source--Melville Scott's Athanasius on the Atonement--which is so strikingly similar to his own theology, has been proven.⁷

Calvin on Union with Christ

As noted in Chapters 1 and 3, Torrance addresses Calvin's doctrine of union with Christ in The School of Faith, rebutting Hendry's critical analysis. In Calvin Torrance posits a universal union with all men via the incarnation whereby they are in Christ.⁸

In light of our study, Torrance's assertion that Calvin believed all men to be ingrafted into Christ by virtue of the incarnation appears most doubtful. Calvin's use of Johannine ingrafting language and the biblical phrase "in Christ" is reserved for mystical and spiritual communion. Also, Torrance appears to misinterpret the Reformer's categories in Psalm 22:23, which imply a legal right to a fraternal relationship with Christ as brother.

In Chapter 3 we also noted Torrance's assertion of a threefold ingrafting into Christ.⁹ Torrance understands one of these insertions in Christ to apply to all men.¹⁰

⁶Thus, the work of Trevor Hart and Iain Torrance is to be welcomed. But, as access to primary texts mushrooms via electronic media, many more such studies will be required from the Torrance school.

⁷See Appendix 13.

⁸Torrance, School of Faith, cxvi-cxvii.

⁹"See *Comm. on Rom.* 11:19 [sic], where Calvin speaks of a threefold ingrafting into Christ" (Torrance, Kingdom and Church, 102, n. 3). The same theme in Calvin is

However, in his commentary on Romans 11:22, Calvin lists his "three modes of ingrafting":

The children of believers, to whom the promise is due according to the covenant made with their fathers, are grafted in. So are these who receive the seed of the Gospel, which either strikes no root, or is choked before it comes to bear fruit. Thirdly, the elect are grafted in, and they are illuminated unto eternal life by the immutable purpose of God.¹¹

Torrance appears to construe Calvin's "the elect" universally, which is most doubtful.¹²

Thus, our study has confirmed Lane's conjecture.¹³ In the terms of Engel's multiperspectival analysis of Calvin, Torrance's reading of Calvin on incarnational union appears to stress only the perspective of God as creator, abolishing the other

discussed in a report of the Church of Scotland's Special Committee on Baptism, which Torrance chaired: "In his *Commentary on Romans* Calvin speaks more precisely of a 'threefold form of grafting and a twofold form of cutting off.'" The report then quotes at length Calvin's comments on Romans 11:22 (Interim Report of the Special Commission on Baptism, Church of Scotland General Assembly, 1957, 680).

¹⁰In his New College lectures, Torrance remarks on this theme: "To meet all this Calvin used to speak of a three-fold ingrafting into Christ or three degrees of the love of God, to all men, to the covenant community and to the individual believer in the decision of his faith" (Torrance, "Range of Redemption," 9). In an interview with this author, Torrance expands on this theme: "Calvin . . . says there is a threefold ingrafting into Christ and a twofold cutting off, [which is] a very interesting expression Now, what is this threefold grafting in? One graft is Christ--we were just speaking about it--he became man and takes all humanity. That's a grafting into Christ, a fundamental grafting into Christ. The other one is baptism And following, . . . faith" (Torrance, interview by author, 29 January 1990, Edinburgh, tape recording).

¹¹Calvin, *Romans*, 253 [Rom. 11:22] *CO* 49:224-225.

¹²In support of a more narrow reading of Calvin on election, see Torrance, "Predestination in Christ," 109. On the vine and branches theme, compare Barth, *CD* IV/2, 659.

¹³Tony Lane takes exception with Torrance's statements on Calvin in *The School of Faith*, countering: "The idea of the headship of Christ over all men is a Barthian idea alien to Calvin." A. N. S. Lane, "The Quest for the Historical Calvin," *Evangelical Quarterly* 60 (1983), 113.

perspectival distinctives.

But the difference between Torrance and Calvin on union with Christ is more than merely semantic or perspectival. Torrance sees only one overarching union with Christ, all stages of which flow out of the hypostatic union itself and necessarily involve all men. Calvin, however, teaches different degrees of union with Christ, which flow out of different kinds of communion or communication with Christ. Each involves different sets of persons, as becomes apparent from close examination of his correspondence with Peter Martyr Vermigli.

For Calvin, mystic communion is a definitive, sacred ingrafting into the life of Jesus Christ by the action of the Holy Spirit upon faith. Spiritual communion is the progressive enjoyment of Christ's incarnate human life, which is brought to believers by the Spirit on the basis of mystic union. Thus, more is implied by this need for a union with Christ via the Spirit in Calvin's teaching than the mere transfer of the effects or benefits of salvation from Christ to the believer. The Spirit is the bond which unites the believer to Christ himself, his life, not just to his benefits. This second step--which is particular and peculiar to believers--can bring the person of Christ to dwell in us in a way in which he was not previously present.

Therefore, Calvin has a more clear and exalted place for the Holy Spirit, as well as mystic union and the benefits of the great exchange with Christ that the Spirit conveys. This is due theologically in no small measure to his clear dogmatic division between redemption accomplished and applied.

Relatedly, Calvin is clearly more wary of the Lutheran communicatio

idiomatum and the theology of the East upon which it is justified than is Torrance.¹⁴

Hendry correctly judges that Calvin does not succeed in integrating the incarnation and atonement after the fashion of the East. But is this a task he deliberately took up? The marked difference between the status of unbelievers versus believers in their relationship to Christ--Calvin's acceptance of Martyr's debilis and infirmus--makes the Eastern view, at least as defined by Hendry, quite removed from Calvin's mind. Calvin grounds the union between the two natures mediately in the person of Christ, emphasizing his office and function as Mediator, not his humanity or divinity *per se*.

In anthropology, Calvin balances his use of traditional, substantialist language for humanity with imputational themes when dealing with the transmission of original sin. However, it is not clear that he ever does so with great depth. He does not decisively reconcile his more forensic view of the transmission of original sin with his more substantialist category of its nature as contagion. This controls the potential in Calvin's theology to inter-relate decisively the doctrines of the incarnation and the atonement. Torrance, however, is greatly concerned with linking the incarnation and atonement. And his own creative theological construction appears to spill over into his understanding of Calvin's teaching.

The reasons for this distortion appear to be twofold: Torrance's negative polemic and his positive interest in Calvin's sacramental theology. The original Sitz im

¹⁴Torrance, in contrast, may overstate this parallel: "John Calvin was more deeply indebted to the Greek Fathers than any other major Reformer . . . although the extent of his indebtedness, e.g., to Cyril of Alexandria, requires further research. Torrance is inclined to overstate it" (David F. Wright, review of Theological Dialogue between Orthodox and Reformed Churches, ed. T. F. Torrance, in Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology 6 [1988]: 40-41).

Leben of Torrance's analysis in The School of Faith is fairly obvious, but his polemic tendency in Calvin studies--demonstrated in his encounter with Hendry--is not isolated to his treatment of union with Christ.¹⁵ For example, Torrance's book on Calvin's anthropology, the only major study on the topic for some forty years, was born in the midst of the Barth-Brunner debate on natural theology.¹⁶ However, this defense of Barth has been sharply criticized for a narrowness in its reading of Calvin.¹⁷ As found

¹⁵Guthridge noted the strong polemic in Torrance's treatment of Calvin. See Guthridge, 424-425.

¹⁶In the Preface to his work, Torrance asserts: "Traditional Calvinism I have studiously avoided, and have made no reference to works on Calvin, ancient or modern, so that this presentation might be free from the imputation of partisanship in any of the different schools . . ." (Torrance, Calvin's Doctrine of Man, 7). But this does not mean Torrance wrote in a vacuum. In his letter of 16 April 1947 to Karl Barth, Torrance clarifies his intent: "I think I may fairly claim that this book does not leave Professor Brunner with a leg to stand on, as far as Calvin is concerned!" Barth noted this remark with an exclamation point in the margin of the letter (T. F. Torrance to Karl Barth, 16 April 1947, original in Karl Barth-Archiv, Basel). The polemic context of Torrance's writing is also noted in the open literature (see D. D. Williams, Interpreting Theology 1918-1952, 38). Barth and Brunner clashed quite strongly on the interpretation of Calvin's doctrine of the *imago dei*. See Emil Brunner and Karl Barth, Natural Theology, trans. P. Fraenkel, (London: Geoffrey Bles, The Centenary Press, 1946), 40-45, 100-109; James Barr, Biblical Faith and Natural Theology, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 6-13, 109, n. 8.

¹⁷Engel applies her multi-perspectival analysis to Calvin's doctrine of the *imago dei*, treating six controversies over Calvin's doctrine. Torrance's Calvin's Doctrine of Man comes in for stiff criticism on each of these points (Engel, 38-42, 50-61). For example: "Throughout that study of Calvin's anthropology he returns again and again to one theme: the *imago dei* is only a gift and not a possession; it is an objective reality (that is, totally dependent on God) and not a subjective reality (that is, actually constitutive of the human subject); it is dynamic or relational and not substantial. Though Torrance's interpretation enjoys a wide acceptance among Calvin scholars, it does not provide a wholly accurate picture of Calvin's view on this point" (Engel, 50). Engel shows that for Calvin the *imago dei* is "both a natural possession and a supernatural gift of a peculiar relationship to God" (Engel, 52). In Torrance's treatment, however, the *imago dei* is "not any natural property of the soul, but is a spiritual reflection in holiness and righteousness" exclusively (Torrance, Calvin's Doctrine of Man, 52).

in our study, Torrance misreads Calvin to suit his own theological agenda.¹⁸ Calvin becomes something of a stimulating occasion for the presentation of Torrance's own thoughts.¹⁹

Torrance's reading of Calvin is also profoundly influenced by a major topic of his early interest: the doctrine of the sacraments. This positive interest of Torrance colored his early years at New College, due to his leadership of the Church of Scotland's Special Commission on Baptism. And when Torrance discusses Calvin's

¹⁸Engel concludes: "I believe it is Torrance's Barthian bias which has led him to this narrow conclusion. He has selected one particular text from a sermon on Job to ground his interpretation. Though this text is only one of a variety of texts which Calvin uses, it does support Torrance's own position of the priority of God the Subject over the human creature. This Barthian fascination with the priority of God *the* Subject prevents him from seeing both sides of Calvin's view" (Engel, 52). Engel even questions Torrance's overall approach to Calvin's doctrine of man, which sees the *imago dei* as the exclusive focus of attention (Engel, 63, n. 2). The wide variety of statements made by Calvin--some of which are contradictory--on these disputed topics can be understood more simply and clearly from Engel's set of Calvin's differing perspectives. Thus, in comparison to Engel's more complex treatment, Torrance's interpretation suffers from a chronic mono-perspectivalism. In fairness to Torrance, Engel's sharp attack might have been more subdued if she had recognized the polemical horizon in which Torrance's 1949 work was composed.

¹⁹Brian Gerrish, review of *School of Faith* by T. F. Torrance, in *Church History* 29 (1960): 364: "In the first place, it does not present a balanced picture of Reformed theology by direct exposition of the catechisms themselves. . . . In the second place, Torrance does not always make it clear when he is *expounding* the theology of the catechisms and when he is *improving* it. He is explicit enough in his disagreements with the Westminster Catechisms, but it seems (to the reviewer, at least) that on several issues Torrance diverges from Calvin also. For example (see pp. cvi ff.), the Westminster Divines were not so very far from Calvin in their understanding of faith-union with Christ (even if we allow that they were more preoccupied with it than he). Torrance also seems to go beyond the main line of Calvin's thinking when he shifts the emphasis of Christ's prophetic office from mere teaching (p. lxxxix). Other questions of interpretation will occur to the reader, but they will not blind him to the general merits of the book: even when his statements are historically debatable, Professor Torrance is always theologically interesting."

doctrine of union with Christ, the sacraments are rarely far from view.²⁰ Thus, Torrance appears to reconstruct the meaning of Books II and III of Calvin's Institutes in light of a sustained misreading of Book IV.²¹

Barth on Union with Christ

Like John Calvin, Karl Barth is concerned that the excesses of the Lutheran fusionists be avoided. However, Barth's solution to this problem is fundamentally different from Calvin's--he shifts into another theological key in order to transcend the issues involved. In other words, Barth flies above the battleground of the historic Lutheran-Reformed scholastic debate over the hypostatic union, using the wings of dialectic and actualism.

While Torrance is deeply concerned to appreciate Barth's insights and major contributions to the progress of dogma, it is not absolutely clear that he has fully appreciated this important aspect of Barth's agenda.²² In his survey of several major

²⁰T. F. Torrance, "Thomas Ayton's The Original Constitution of the Christian Church," in Reformation and Revolution, ed. Duncan Shaw (Edinburgh: St. Andrews Press, 1967), 275-276: "It is the substitution of a judicial for an evangelical relation to Christ that has prevented us from understanding Calvin's great doctrine of union with Christ in His human nature and correspondingly of the sacramental union." See also Torrance, Kingdom and Church, 100-104; Torrance, Conflict and Agreement, vol. 2, The Ministry and the Sacraments of the Church, 142-148; Torrance, School of Faith, cviii-cix. It is interesting that Torrance's understanding of Robert Bruce on union with Christ is also primarily shaped by comments on the eucharist (Torrance, Introduction, Bruce's Sermons on the Lord's Supper).

²¹Gerrish notes that Calvin's doctrine of predestination is behind his doctrine of the sacraments (Gerrish, Grace and Gratitude, 169-171). Is this not an element in Calvin's thought to which Torrance is blind?

²²Torrance's appreciation for Barth is nearly legendary: "A former doctoral student and lifelong disciple of Barth, Torrance describes him as 'the greatest theologian . . . for several hundred years,' rivaling Athanasius and Augustine, Luther and Calvin,

secondary works on Barth, Hunsinger notes of Torrance's work:

The energy, dynamism, and sense of collision which enter Barth's theology by way of the actualistic and particularistic motifs never quite come through in Torrance's account. Instead of actualism and particularism enlivening the objectivism, the objectivism is allowed to mute and soften the actualism and particularism.²³

This smothering of Barth's actualism produces "a certain distortion factor at work in Torrance's account."²⁴ Clements observes that the political background to this actualistic theme, Barth's socialist political convictions, goes missing in Torrance's presentation.²⁵ McPake also notes this loss of actualism, in both Torrance's reading of

comparable with Shakespeare, Mozart, Newton, Clerk Maxwell, Einstein, et al. Such enthusiasm is both the strength and weakness of this book" (Trevor Williams, review of Karl Barth, Biblical and Evangelical Theologian by T. F. Torrance, in New Blackfriars 73 [1992]: 462-463).

²³Hunsinger, How to Read Karl Barth, 11. Hunsinger attributes this phenomenon to Torrance's interest in theological science. Torrance's first book on Barth's early years is written teleologically, with one eye on the end to which the young Barth was moving. By its publication in 1962, even Church Dogmatics IV/2 had been seen by Torrance. Thus, Torrance's reading of the older Barth is not irrelevant to this volume.

²⁴"On the whole Torrance perhaps displays a better sense of the overall complexity of Barth's theology than does von Balthasar. Yet the unity of that complexity does not really emerge, and there is a certain distortion factor at work in Torrance's account. A prominence is assigned to revelational objectivism which is not really there in Barth. At the same time there is a corresponding underestimation of the radicality of Barth's actualism and particularism (even though these do not go unexamined). The result is not only a stultifying effect which tends to drain away some of the vitality of Barth's thought, but also an unfortunate if implicit nomination of revelational objectivism as the motif which unifies Barth's theology as a whole" (Hunsinger, How to Read Karl Barth, 21).

²⁵Keith W. Clements, review of Karl Barth, Biblical and Evangelical Theologian by T. F. Torrance, in Expository Times 103 (1991): 29: "With Torrance, for all the profundity of insight one must ask whether a process of abstracting Barth from his personal historical context has not also been taking place. For example, as is made clear in Eberhard Busch's biography, the 'red pastor of Safenwil' was far more deeply immersed in social and political issues than is implied by Torrance's account, and that involvement was not just a consequence of, but a way into, his new theological

Barth's doctrine of the fallen humanity of Christ is only possible because of his shift to actualistic categories, which allows the unique combination of themes drawn from Bezzel and Vogel, but in a functional, not an essentialist, tension. Torrance, however, by linking his doctrine of Christ's fallen humanity so strongly to the non-assumptus, unavoidably faces a serious challenge: overcoming the associations of a substantialist ontology that cling to his medical model.²⁷ Barth's actualistic ontology relieves him of this burden.²⁸ Torrance's does not. Instead, Torrance compounds his burden by pushing the tension to a deeper and more profound level using his construction of anhypostasia and enhypostasia. While Barth can emphasize the role of

discovery. That may offer a clue to Barth's future not less than his past."

²⁶McPake, 301-309, 374-375 (n. 73). Linking this lacuna with Torrance's strong distinction between Barth's dialectic and dialogical or christological phases, McPake connects this reading of Barth with the loss of the actualistic edge he senses in Torrance's own construction of both the anhypostatic-enhypostatic patristic couplet and Torrance's corresponding doctrine of the fallen humanity of Christ.

²⁷"Now medical analogies for salvation are very natural, very common and notoriously dangerous Medical language in its basic sense tends to suggest bodily healing and is always therefore likely to suggest a somewhat automatic healing process It would be difficult to find any generally agreed medical principle as the analogue behind the conviction that 'the unassumed is the unhealed'" (M. F. Wiles, "The Unassumed is the Unhealed," Religious Studies 4 [1968]: 50-51). Torrance has been charged with having a substantialist ontology: "T.'s Nicene substance ontology is untenable, as is his belief that human nature is a distinct assumable entity" (Robert P. Tucker, review of The Mediation of Christ, in Theological Studies 45 [1984]: 769). Torrance's concept of the "healing" of original sin is especially open to objection.

²⁸This relieves Barth of a tremendous burden in the context of modern theology. See John McIntyre, The Shape of Christology, 106, 112; James Mackey, Jesus: the Man and the Myth, 243; David G. A. Calvert, From Christ to God, 11-12; and Pannenberg, Human Nature, Election and History, 24. Whether Barth is ultimately successful in his effort is debatable. While actualism certainly avoids these issues, it may do little more. See Pannenberg, Jesus--God and Man, 302-303.

the Holy Spirit in the sanctification of Jesus Christ and eschew any alteration to Christ's humanity, Torrance is left highlighting the role of the Logos and stressing alteration via his medical model.

Whatever differences may lie at the heart of their ontologies, Barth clearly positions the emphasis of his doctrine of union with Christ differently than does Torrance. Barth places union with Christ under the rubric of vocation, making it the goal of vocation and linking it quite strongly with the purpose of vocation, witness. On this basis, Barth is even able radically--for the Reformed tradition at least--to reject infant baptism and instead deploy baptism as an act of Christian witness.²⁹

The conflict in the opinions of Torrance and Barth on infant baptism is an interesting point of tension in their theologies, which is then not wholly unrelated to the topic of our study. In his second book on Barth, Torrance gives the impression that his Basel mentor was somewhat ambivalent about infant baptism, agreeing late in life with Torrance's own arguments in favor of it, which would be a change from his published position in Church Dogmatics IV/4 (fragment).³⁰ Quite the opposite is true,

²⁹Barth, CD IV/4 (fragment), 159, 185-186.

³⁰Torrance, Karl Barth, Biblical and Evangelical Theologian, 135: "It may be worth recalling another incident in my interaction with Karl Barth, when he came to Edinburgh in 1966 to receive an honorary degree. He was accompanied by his eldest son Markus who knew of my critical attitude to his book on *Baptism* and wanted an *Auseinandersetzung* with me. We discussed the doctrine of Baptism for nearly a whole day in the presence of his father when I argued for an understanding of Baptism as the Sacrament of the vicarious obedience of Christ the Servant-Son. Karl Barth himself remained silent throughout, but at the end of the day he turned to his son and said simply, '*Nicht so schlecht, Markus*'!" This chapter is actually a reprint of an earlier article: Torrance, "My Interaction with Karl Barth." This same statement is included in the earlier version.

however.³¹

Interestingly, this conversation with Torrance may, however, explain Barth's reference to "vicarious faith" in his fragment on baptism.³² However, the similarity of their terminology should not be overplayed. At the heart of Barth's concept of "vicarious faith" is a strong emphasis on the necessity of the active faith of the baptized.³³ In Torrance's theology the emphasis is exactly the opposite--on the need for the baptized to be passive, letting Christ's active faith stand in for her.³⁴

³¹Barth did not visit Edinburgh for an honorary degree in 1966 but in 1956. Busch notes that Markus accompanied his father on this trip (Busch, 422). Note the dedication to KD IV/3: "Der Universität Edinburgh in Dankbarkeit." Curiously, the dedication pages were omitted from the English translation volumes. The correspondence between Barth and Torrance confirms this dating. See Appendix 7. Hence, the conversation took place in 1956, before Barth's shift on the doctrine in his 1959-60 lectures and before the publication of CD IV/4 (fragment). See Barth, CD IV/4 (fragment), ix.

³²Barth, CD IV/4 (fragment), 186: "There is vicarious faith, however, only in the form of the faith which Jesus Christ establishes for us all as the . . . [Perfector] (Heb. 12²), who empowers us for our own faith, and summons us to it, even as He stands there in our stead with His faith. Through His faith we are not only moved but liberated to believe for ourselves."

³³Barth, CD IV/4 (fragment), 186: "Since we ourselves are freed to believe, believing is something which no one else with his faith can do for us: not even the most believing parents, the strongest Christian brother, the most vital community, the whole Church, the full chorus of believers in every century and country. That a man actually believes, that he himself believes even though enabled and awakened to do so by the faith of Jesus Christ, can only be his own decision. To be sure, he does not take it alone. He takes it in a fellowship with all these others which helps and sustains him. Nevertheless, no one can lift it from him or take it for him. No other can represent him here But the personal faith of the candidate is indispensable to baptism. He is not asked whether his faith is perfect. But he is asked concerning his faith, however feeble." Is Barth's emphasis upon activity in polemic against "a feeling of absolute dependence"? See Barth, Göttingen Dogmatics, vol. 1, 180, 188, 190, 193.

³⁴Torrance, Theology in Reconciliation, 87; and "Report of the Special Commission on Baptism," Minutes of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland [May 1961], 721-722: "Baptism is administered *to* us in the Name of the Triune God, and we

Is there then, in the heart of their sacramental theologies, a christological difference of import for our comparison of Torrance and Barth on union with Christ?³⁵ Torrance obviously had christological concerns, feeling Barth to be going against the incarnational thrust of the rest of his thought.³⁶ Barth had strong concerns as well, but about Torrance's own sacramental and christological position.³⁷ Webster aptly concludes:

Behind this lies a deeper incompatibility at the level of Christology: where Torrance sees the acts of Jesus as solely vicarious, Barth sees them as representative acts which are nevertheless more than simply completed events containing proleptically our involvement: they are "really an imperative" (CD IV/4:67).³⁸

Neither Barth nor Torrance gave up his position on infant baptism. If the doctrine of

receive it *passively*, for we cannot add to Christ's finished work. Whatever our age may be, we must receive it 'as little children,' and 'as little children' enter into His Kingdom of Grace. It is God's work." This emphasis in Torrance appears to be drawn from James Candlish, The Christian Salvation: Lectures on the Work of Christ--Its Appropriation and Its Issues (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899), 141, 162. Note, however, in his original context, Candlish is merely contrasting baptism and the Lord's Supper.

³⁵The question of whether this difference on baptism might imply a difference in christologies was raised by J. B. Webster, "The Christian in Revolt: Some Reflections on *The Christian Life*," in Reckoning with Barth: Essays in Commemoration of the Centenary of Karl Barth's Birth, ed. Nigel Biggar (London: Mowbray, 1988), 126.

³⁶Torrance, Theology in Reconciliation, 90.

³⁷Karl Barth to T. F. Torrance, letter of 8 April 1960, Karl Barth-Archiv, Basel: "Ist die Taufe im NT wirklich, was Sie nach allen entscheidenden Aussagen ihres Reports wäre: eine Fortsetzung, Verlängerung, Vergegenwärtigung der Inkarnation, des Werkes Jesu Christi selbst? Darf man ihren Charakter als Aktion der Gemeinde und ihrer Täuflinge so verwischen?" ET: "Is baptism in the New Testament truly that which you claim in all of your statements of your report: a continuation, prolonging, recalling of the incarnation of the work of Jesus Christ itself? Is it allowed to obscure the character as an action of the congregation and its members to be baptized?"

³⁸Webster, "The Christian in Revolt," 126.

the church and sacraments is to be self-consciously christological rather than merely pragmatic, as is undoubtedly the case with these two great thinkers, then their fundamental ecclesiastical and sacramental divergence must make a difference at a deep and profound level.

For Karl Barth, all humankind are chosen from eternity to be "in Christ" by virtue of God's decision about them in election. This decision comes to us historically, concretely, actualistically in the person of Jesus Christ. But we are not "in Christ" and do not have union with Christ until we are joined by the Spirit to him. For T. F. Torrance, all humankind are in Christ because the creator Logos has assumed, sanctified, and healed our fallen humanity. All are in Christ by virtue of their carnal union with Christ.

Torrance on Union with Christ

In Chapter 1 we saw that Torrance's development of anhypostasia and enhypostasia, to which his doctrine of carnal union with Christ is so intimately related, is based on his interaction with a variety of historical sources, both ancient and modern.

Especially striking is the debt Torrance owes to themes drawn from Dale, Maurice, Carlyle and Luther. Dale's final lecture is different from all the rest in his book, apparently due to the impact of Maurice on his thinking about the incarnation and atonement.³⁹ These themes especially are appropriated by Torrance, later

³⁹At the outset of his tenth and final lecture, Dale states his intention to build on the "doctrine concerning that relation to the human race which illustrates the theory of the Atonement" of F. D. Maurice (see Dale, The Atonement, 461). Torrance himself points out Dale's debt to Maurice for this element of his theory (see Torrance, "The

becoming more formally organized under the anhypostatic rubric. Torrance's receptivity to these themes was perhaps more prompted by the influence of H. A. A. Kennedy than H. R. Mackintosh. Note that Kennedy stresses the cosmic Christ theme, whereas Mackintosh is dismissive of Maurice.⁴⁰ Also note that Kennedy's cosmic

Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 278). Maurice emphasized Christ's original headship over every man as Creator and the resulting inclusion of all of mankind in the atoning work (see Christenson, The Divine Order: A Study in F. D. Maurice's Theology, 35-36, 217). Dale builds the tenth lecture in The Atonement explicitly on this foundation. In the tenth lecture of The Atonement, Dale develops a theory of the original headship of Christ rooted in his unique position as Creator and Head of the human race. He describes Christ's atonement as a function of this representative role in which He makes a morally ideal submission to sin's penalties, enabling the submission of man. (Dale, The Atonement, 468-481). That Dale is appending a self-consciously supplemental and disjunctive theory to the remainder of his lectures in the tenth lecture is recognized by L. W. Grensted and R. C. Moberly (see L. W. Grensted, A Short History of the Atonement [Manchester: The University Press, 1920], 318-319, and R. C. Moberly, Atonement and Personality [London: John Murray, 1909], 280. Torrance explicitly draws on the tenth and final lecture of R. W. Dale's The Atonement in the course of further developing his thoughts on the dual nature of the atonement in his unpublished Auburn lectures, preferring Dale's scheme to that of McLeod Campbell (Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 269). Torrance echoes Dale's use of the original relation of Christ to mankind in terms of the Imago Dei (Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 279). He explicitly quotes and incorporates Dale's idea of representative submission (compare Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 280-281; and Dale, The Atonement, 479-480). The Auburn lectures also employ Dale's axiomatic use of Christ's cry of desolation as an encapsulation of penalty (compare Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 282-283; and Dale, The Atonement, 481). J. K. Mozley rightly identifies this as a central aspect of Dale's theory (J. K. Mozley, The Doctrine of the Atonement, 178). It is clear that Torrance draws heavily on Dale in the development of his christology in the Auburn lectures.

⁴⁰H. A. A. Kennedy, Theology of the Epistles, 153: "It is an easy and natural step from this position to find in Christ the focus of the cosmic system, the constitutive principle of universal life." Compare Mackintosh, 276: "Maurice, like Coleridge, showed a Platonic tendency to speak of principles or ideas rather than of persons; and it would probably be a fair criticism on certain expressions in his works to say that they have the effect of depersonalising Christ, and of representing Him almost as a vague spiritual atmosphere or element, rather than as an historic Figure with specific qualities revealed by His career on earth."

Christ theme is indebted to Johannes Weiss, Ritschl's son-in-law.⁴¹

Without question, Torrance is also indebted to his former Professor of Christian Dogmatics, but that debt must be carefully stated. As we have seen, Mackintosh played an important role in shaping the interests and approach of Torrance to christology, in addition to first introducing him to the theology of Karl Barth. However, it is questionable whether Mackintosh played exactly the same kind of role now so well remembered.⁴² While Torrance is clearly indebted to Mackintosh for what Trook calls the "Mackintoshian synthesis," in Mackintosh's hands this formula, that Christ is "a man and Man," is a profoundly ethical concept, belying his Ritschlian roots, if not a Herrmannian one.⁴³ Mackintosh does closely link his ethical synthesis with the patristic couplet that so fascinates Torrance, but Mackintosh fundamentally misunderstands anhypostasia as denying Christ of any human personality. From his Ritschlian kenotic perspective, Mackintosh finds this doctrine most objectionable.⁴⁴

⁴¹See Kennedy, Theology of the Epistles, 157, n. 2.

⁴²See McPake.

⁴³We have seen evidence in Torrance's unpublished materials pointing strongly in the same direction. For example: "In other words here in Christ we have the very Word of God, God's own speech and action. The paradox of this is that this is seen by faith alone. Any other attempt which argues to Christ in His significance for faith from the impression he makes upon his followers as The Ritschlian School does in whose wake has tumbled most of modern Christology even including H. R. Mackintosh-- Though to a limited extent--or which argues from His piety or ethical values as does the related thought of Schleiermacher and the Neo-Kantians, must face insuperable problems for they start with the humanity of Christ, and starting thus cannot get beyond it, even with the aid of the best and most skillful dialectic" (Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 103). Trook seems to imply this fact (Trook, 60-62). Even Redman admits this fact: Redman, "Participatio Christi: H. R. Mackintosh's Theology of the Unio Mystica," Scottish Journal of Theology, 49 (1996), 217.

⁴⁴Mackintosh, 385-386.

Thus, on the one hand, our study tends to confirm McPake's fine study. On the other, it appears that Torrance's place in Scottish theology is perhaps more profound than he himself even recognizes, since, like his Basel mentor, his own self interpretation requires some revision. Was it, perhaps, Torrance who helped make possible the profound transition from the ethical theology of Ritschl to the christocentric theology of Barth on Scottish soil, rather than Mackintosh? We believe Torrance has made a unique contribution to modern Scottish theology previously not appreciated.

Thus, from an historical perspective, Torrance has revised the concept of anhypostasia and enhypostasia in an unprecedented fashion. Even Karl Barth did not develop this patristic couplet in the same manner or to the same degree as his former student. But the value of a theological construct is not so much in its historical pedigree, but in its conceptual cogency. It is on this ground that Torrance's theologoumenon must be judged. The primary issue is, then, the cogency of this concept as Torrance has developed it. This is all the more important because for Torrance carnal union with Christ is foundational to the mediation of Christ. To these questions we now turn.

Anhypostatic Solidarity and the Holy Spirit

As noted in Chapter 1, the non-assumptus is something of an effective vehicle through which Torrance communicates key christological and soteriological themes developed earlier in his career. But the abbreviated nature of the non-assumptus only compounds the potential for confusion about Torrance's doctrine of anhypostatic solidarity. In the non-assumptus it is the Logos who is exclusively pushed center stage. The role of the Holy Spirit in the incarnation--which we saw in Chapter 1 was

so stressed by Heidegger--is edited out of salvation history, due to the abbreviated nature of its presentation. In addition, expansive use of the non-assumptus obscures a fundamental point of debate, even within the Reformed tradition: who is the subject of our redemption--the Logos simpliciter or the God-man?⁴⁵

This lacuna, in what is perhaps Torrance's most effective rhetorical tool, creates potential problems not just for the communication of his doctrine of Christ's person, but for the mediation of Christ in his vicarious humanity and the subsequent soteriology based upon it. One's sense that Torrance has failed to develop a proper role for the Holy Spirit in relation to the work of Christ, or one's sense that he fails to articulate a proper relation between the response of human beings and Christ's vicarious response for them, may have its ultimate christological source in anxiety over anhypostatic solidarity as presented by the non-assumptus.

Thomas Smail, in the quotation with which our chapter opened, expresses grave reservations about Torrance's doctrine of the vicarious humanity of Christ, charging that it fails to distinguish between Christ's response to God and our own, as well as between the work of the Spirit and the work of Christ.⁴⁶ Indeed, his concern is so great that it apparently prompted him to write his entire volume.⁴⁷

In the published version of his study developing the concept of Christ's vicarious humanity, Christian Kettler rushes to defend Torrance against Smail's charge, as given in the second quotation with which our chapter opened. Note the way in

⁴⁵McCormack, "For Us and For Our Salvation," 22, n. 58.

⁴⁶Smail, 109-111.

⁴⁷Smail, 112.

which Kettler responds to Torrance's critic: "Smail misreads Torrance when he says that the latter does not have a place for my individual human response."⁴⁸ Kettler then goes on to stress the need to participate in Christ's vicarious faith.⁴⁹

Here we have an unresolved dispute over the role of the Holy Spirit and human response in the theology of T. F. Torrance.⁵⁰ In light of our study, the current impasse is better clarified. The issue Smail is raising on its most fundamental level in Torrance's christology is not whether he has any place for individual human response, as Kettler charges. Of course Torrance has a place for human response. This does not, however, answer Smail's charge, but rather raises the question of how the human response relates to Christ's vicarious response, and what precisely is the nature of that response. In other words, the real root problems in Torrance's system uncovered by Smail's critique--but untouched by Kettler's or Torrance's rejoinders--are questions of the nature of Christ's vicarious response and the nature of individual human response in relation to it. Behind these soteriological questions lie the doctrines of carnal union with Christ and the anhypostatic solidarity flowing from it. Thus, Kettler's call to merely recognize participation may never ultimately satisfy. Responding to a concern springing from anhypostatic solidarity with repeated appeals to the fruit of enhypostasia, or even the mystery of iniquity, is to miss the point altogether. And shouting "dualist" or "charismatic" at the critic will hardly settle any theological dispute

⁴⁸Kettler, 140.

⁴⁹Kettler, 140-141.

⁵⁰This dispute between Smail and Kettler has been noted but not satisfyingly resolved by other scholars: Koedyker, 253-254; and Colyer, 292-293, n. 58.

effectively.⁵¹

Removing the shadow cast by the non-assumptus and by the expansive use of a medical model across the Holy Spirit and soteriology requires a deeper answer. To silence his critics, Torrance must respond from within his own christological doctrine of anhypostatic solidarity, both stressing and clarifying the role of the Holy Spirit in creation, incarnation, and redemption.

But, is it possible for Torrance to do this without a radical revision at the heart of his christocentric dogmatics? This is not a vain question because of the absolutely central role anhypostatic solidarity plays in Torrance's thought. Its impact is felt from his epistemology to his eschatology. Torrance has made some attempts in this direction.⁵² But the most developed presentation of Torrance's doctrine of the Holy Spirit is given in his introduction to The School of Faith, and this is precisely where our interest in the issue was initially piqued. Here Torrance subsumes spiritual union under carnal union, which can only serve to reinforce suspicion that his anhypostatic theme does an injustice to the Holy Spirit. And as we saw earlier in Chapter 1, while interacting in his unpublished New College lectures with Heidegger's doctrine of the assumptio, Torrance cut out Heidegger's strong emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit in the incarnation. An essential revision may be required, but Torrance has of late

⁵¹Colyer, 292-293, n. 58.

⁵²Note Kirby's analysis of a recent such attempt: Kirby, 325. Also see T. F. Torrance, "The Epistemological Relevance of the Holy Spirit," in Ex Auditū Verbi: Theologische Opstellen Aangeboden aan Prof. Dr. G. C. Berkouwer (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1965), 278; Torrance, Mediation of Christ, xii; and Torrance, Divine Meaning, 73, 69. But these may well be too little and too late, respectively. The new Foreword added to the new edition of Mediation of Christ carries little more force than Kettler's rebuttal and raises a host of exegetical questions on Galatians 2:20.

perhaps shown some interest in more closely examining the role of the Holy Spirit, even quite radically.

Like Barth before him, Torrance has been charged with having a thoroughgoing Christomonism lurking secretly in his system.⁵³ In the case of Barth, his actualism may save him from this charge.⁵⁴ But with Torrance, the question should be taken and answered much more seriously, since that same way of escape may not be open to his construct.⁵⁵

Anhypostatic Solidarity and Contingent Necessity

In addition to concerns about the role of the Holy Spirit in carnal union and the resulting anhypostatic solidarity, Torrance's doctrine prompts a second line of concern. In the way he has presented and described it, the anhypostatic solidarity of carnal union places constraints upon the nature of the incarnation. This is not to say that the incarnation itself is an absolute necessity in Torrance's theology: God was free to

⁵³Kirby, 236; Macleod, "Christology," 176; and Tim Bradshaw, review of The Mediation of Christ by T. F. Torrance, in Evangel 3 (1985): 23-24: "But surely it is not pelagian to affirm that the person in whose life the Spirit is at work has faith in Christ? For Torrance even personal faith is vicarious; we must have faith in Christ's faith. . . . It may be that a now fashionable criticism of Barth that there is a neglect of the Holy Spirit's work *in* the believer, applies to Torrance."

⁵⁴For the charge of christomonism against Barth, see Philip J. Rosato, The Spirit as Lord: The Pneumatology of Karl Barth (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1981), 161. Barth's invocation of actualistic categories may save him from this charge.

⁵⁵However, given Torrance's stress on trinitarianism, as well as the ambiguous nature of "monisms," this charge may never be convincing to many. See Bromiley, "Karl Barth," 52; and Herrman Bavinck, Philosophy of Revelation (London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1909), 39.

choose not to incarnate.⁵⁶ However, once deciding to incarnate, by contingent or consequent absolute necessity, the nature of the incarnation had to be just the way Torrance describes it.

Torrance amply illustrates this conviction:

It is in Jesus Christ the incarnate Creator, then, that the being of all men, whether they believe or not, is creatively grounded and is unceasingly sustained. But his incarnate constitution as the Mediator between God and man who is at once Creator God and creaturely man, Jesus Christ as Man represents all mankind: in him all men have the creative and sustaining source of their being. He cannot but represent in his death all whom he represents in his incarnate constitution. Atonement and incarnation cannot be separated from one another, and therefore the range of his representation is the same in both.⁵⁷

On the other hand, it will also operate under the conviction that since Jesus Christ is the Incarnate Son of God through whom all things were created and endowed with their rational order, no redemptive intervention by God through him will violate that rational order but only heal and restore it wherever it has been disturbed or corrupted.⁵⁸

Thus the Incarnation of the Son in our humanity has its source in the hidden creative act of God, but it also assumes a form in the entry of the Son into our humanity which is appropriate to and is required by the nature of the incarnate Son as Creator as well as creature.⁵⁹

Thus, the extent of the incarnation was a contingent necessity for the Logos.

Because of the universal range of anhypostatic solidarity, Christ must--by contingent

⁵⁶Though, one might add, tensions in Torrance's own systematic relation of the doctrines of creation and redemption may prompt one to question the cogency of Torrance's explicit denials of the absolute necessity of the incarnation.

⁵⁷Torrance, "The Atonement: The Singularity of Christ and the Finality of the Cross: The Atonement and the Moral Order," 244-245.

⁵⁸Torrance, Christian Frame of Mind, 33.

⁵⁹Torrance, "The Once for All Union of God and Man in Christ--His Birth Into Our Humanity," 11. See also, Torrance, Space, Time and Incarnation, 66; and Torrance, The Christian Doctrine of God, One Being Three Persons, 216.

necessity--represent and be carnally united to all human beings in his person and work.

Firstly, if true, then God must be a universalist. Granted, Torrance himself is not a universalist, because he sees a doctrine of hell in the Bible and has an important place for the mystery of iniquity in his thinking, as we have previously seen. But if the nature of the incarnation is so constrained as to require universal representation of an ontological sort, then has not the freedom of God been compromised in a subtle but important fashion?

Even Torrance's Basel mentor, Karl Barth, did not push the nature of incarnation to this length. As Bromiley notes:

The universalist trend derives from Barth's excellent objectivism in opposition to Bultmann. Again, Barth is not an express universalist. Barth is not speaking at random when he resists those who say that he should logically be a universalist. So far as individuals go, he sees the position in terms of a shifting line of evangelism (his deep-rooted activism) under the Spirit's sovereignty. If we cannot reject the possibility that all will be saved, we cannot say that they must be.⁶⁰

Thus, Barth is an agnostic on the issue of universalism, but demands that it be left an open question. Since decision and election are held so high, Barth allows nothing to constrain the freedom of God and the sovereignty of the Spirit. God is completely free in all directions: he does not have to be a universalist.⁶¹

While Barth's universalist trend is aimed more against Bultmann, we have previously seen that Torrance's is aimed more against Scottish Calvinism and its

⁶⁰Bromiley, "Karl Barth," 54.

⁶¹Due to his actualist ontology, it is not clear that this question of a constraint on the nature of the incarnation is even an issue for Barth. Barth's problems in this area, if any, would appear to be less than Torrance's.

doctrine of limited atonement.⁶² His polemic, however, has led him to compromise the freedom of God, and to contradict his own denial of universalism. His subsuming spiritual under carnal union may not be unrelated to this difference in emphasis and polemic.

Secondly, this contingent necessity on the nature of the incarnation truncates the voluntary nature of Christ's person and work. The concern to protect Christ's voluntarism has long been a tradition in the Christian West, dating back even to Aquinas. As Hendry cogently summarizes:

The Greek fathers had sought to build a bridge between the work of Christ *for* us and its appropriation *by* us with the doctrine of Christ incarnate *in* us; but to Aquinas this bridge had become a dam; it seemed to him that the idea of the universal or inclusive humanity of Christ would destroy the vicarious character of his work, which is intentional rather than natural: "The Son of God became incarnate as the common Savior of all men, not by community of genus or species, such as belongs to a nature distinct from individuals, but by community of cause, inasmuch as The Son of God became incarnate for the sake of universal human salvation."⁶³

Ironically, in order to make his point, the theologian from whom Aquinas draws positively to justify his point is John of Damascus.⁶⁴ This same concern to protect the

⁶²Bromiley, 54.

⁶³George S. Hendry, The Gospel of the Incarnation (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1958), 67. Note Hendry's distinction between the intentional and natural character of Christ's work. Unfortunately, Hendry goes on to obscure Thomas' incisive concern by adding: "Thomas is not quite consistent, however, when he argues later that the sufferings of Christ were universal in *genus* (though not in *species*). S.T., III, Q. 46, A.5" (Hendry, 67, n. 11). In this context, however, Aquinas is not considering the genus of that which suffers, but the *genus of suffering*.

⁶⁴Compare Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologiae, Vol. 48, trans. and ed. R. J. Hennessey (New York: McGraw-Hill/Blackfriars, 1964), 129-131 [III. Q.4, A.5]; and John of Damascus, Exposition of the Orthodox Faith, Vol. 9 In Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989), 55 [III, XI].

voluntary nature of Christ's sacrifice from intrusions of the constraint of nature is not unknown in Scottish theology.⁶⁵

By his contingent necessity, Torrance runs the danger of making the person and work of Christ relevant to everybody and meaningful to none. Gerald Bray has put this general concern quite well:

...in the person of the Son, God has united manhood to himself. This is not universalism, not because there is no compulsion in love--there is--but because the compulsion of love speaks to persons, not to categories. It is not mankind as a species which is saved, but Tom, Dick, and Harry, Emma, Jane and Elizabeth.⁶⁶

Especially in our day and age, will a doctrine including a constraint of nature, which to many ears might smack of determinism, touch modern women and men isolated and abandoned in our overcrowded cities? Do they not want to hear that God in the flesh is there for them, choosing to love them, volunteering to save them, personally and individually, rather than by a doctrine that involves a contingent necessity of nature? Will that make them feel like merely one of the herd?

Torrance argues that the nature of the incarnation must be just his way. At the very least, may we not respond minimalistically to this contingent necessity that constrains

⁶⁵"Nor did Jesus become the sin-bearer by any necessity of nature in virtue of taking the flesh. This was the error of Menken and Irving, who thought that He assumed sin simply in virtue of taking humanity; as if sin and humanity were the same. Their theory was, that our Lord took to Himself a portion of the lump or mass, and that, in consequence of this, He personally, and not officially, but by necessity of nature and not by voluntary consent, came under the obligations of that humanity of which He had assumed a part. This is a confusion of thought, which does not discern the things that differ, as well as perilous theology" (George Smeaton, Christ's Doctrine of the Atonement [Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1991, reprint of 1871 edition], 123).

⁶⁶Gerald Bray, Creeds, Councils and Christ (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1984), 202.

the nature of the incarnation, countering only that the universal anhypostatic solidarity Torrance envisions might not be the case?

Anhypostatic Solidarity Revisited

However, even if we grant Torrance's anhypostatic solidarity without further query, other unanswered questions are troubling.

For example, does Torrance's anhypostatic solidarity demand concupiscence in the Saviour? As seen in Chapter 1, Torrance in his Auburn lectures appears to try to steer clear of that kind of internal struggle, for ethical reasons. Recently, however, Torrance's own arguments have been used to strongly argue the opposite.⁶⁷ The same issue is problematic in Barth's theology.⁶⁸ However, it is not clear that Torrance's doctrine of carnal union with Christ and anhypostatic solidarity finally settle the matter.

The same is true for baptism. Why does anhypostatic solidarity not imply indiscriminate, universal baptism? There would appear to be little at the heart of Torrance's doctrine of union with Christ that would prevent this and quite a bit to commend it, especially if we are called to be passive as we stand at the font.

⁶⁷"... if he is preserved from 'concupiscence', if temptation does not arise within him, then all that has been done christologically here is to draw the line closer to the boundary of a humanity like ours, but still decisively divorced from it in its most needy condition. In this case Christ did not subdue and heal our concupiscent nature by assuming it and struggling with it from within, finally rendering it back to God through moral victory. Instead he assumed a humanity which lacked this particular problem" (Trevor Hart, review of In the Likeness of Sinful Flesh: An Essay on the Humanity of Christ by Thomas G. Weinandy, in Scottish Journal of Theology 49 [1996]: 254-255).

⁶⁸See Barth, CD I/2, 158. Barth's actualism demands internal struggle in the life of Christ, due to "*natura vitata*" in his doctrine of the fallen humanity of Christ (Barth, CD I/2, 153). See D. Macleod, "The Doctrine of the Incarnation in Scottish Theology: Edward Irving," Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology 9 (1991): 42, 46-47. CD I/2, 153, 158.

In justification, another anhypostatic question is encountered: has a legal forensic fiction been exchanged for an even greater ontological one? And does Torrance's anhypostatic theme not run the danger of prompting indifference?⁶⁹

As previously seen in Chapter 1, Torrance insists that his development of each half of his theological couplet must be balanced against the other. Considered by itself, anhypostasia leads to causal, necessitarian, mechanical, and physical solidarity. But, by balancing it over against enhypostasia, the strong theological implications of the first half of the couplet are canceled out by the other. The balance drawn, however, does not cancel out either side of the relation: anhypostatic solidarity is still a locus of discussion in Torrance's christology, in spite of the counter weighting enhypostatic relation. Thus, here we see at the heart of Torrance's christocentric dogmatics an unresolved juxtaposition of two accounts of the incarnation.

In itself, this structural aspect of Torrance's thought is not necessarily problematic. As noted earlier, Ian Ramsey, in his treatment of "disclosure models," calls on theology to employ a diversity of models in its trade, eschewing uniformly flat theological discourse. But is Ramsey's call for multiple perspectives in theology ever really achieved by Torrance's disclosure model or theological algebra?

For all the confessed need for balance between anhypostasia and enhypostasia, it is difficult to escape the nagging feeling that very little balance is in the end achieved. As Torrance develops it, anhypostasia is so important to his wider theological concerns that it appears to capture his imagination and dominate his interest. These juxtaposed

⁶⁹Robert P. Tucker, review of The Mediation of Christ by T. F. Torrance, Theological Studies 45 (1984): 769: "Within a docetic anthropology of worship T. replaces our faith, decisions, and prayers with Christ's. (Why then should we bother?)"

themes are not so much balanced, complementing each other in his christocentric dogmatics, as they are they left unstable, in non-complementary tension. Each points to opposite, conflicting conclusions, inescapably requiring an arbitrator between them. What, or who, then, arbitrates between anhypostasias and enhypostasias at the heart of Torrance's christology?

It is apt that Torrance's epistemology provides the answers required to these pressing questions via intuition.⁷⁰

⁷⁰Ronald F. Thiemann takes strong exception to Torrance's appeal to intuition in the realm of theology and revelation, identifying it as "an incoherent notion of non-inferential intuition as the means of asserting the priority of God's gracious reality" (see R. F. Thiemann, Revelation and Theology [Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1985], 7). In a treatment of intuition in Torrance's theology, Thiemann goes on to charge the Edinburgh dogmatician with being a foundationalist, for "Torrance uses the term intuition to signify the indubitability and incorrigibility of this causally imposed knowledge" (see Thiemann, 38-43, especially page 40). In his New College dissertation tracing the entrance of Barth to the Scottish scene, John McPake appreciates Thiemann's analysis of the role of intuition in Torrance's theology (see McPake, 324-330). McPake goes on to trace lines of continuity between Torrance's intuition and that in the theologies of John Baillie and Norman Kemp Smith (see McPake, 330-335). Thiemann's charge of foundationalism has not gone unanswered. Feenstra counters that while Thiemann has given a compelling critique of "strong foundationalism," he has left Torrance's "weak foundationalism" untouched (see Ronald J. Feenstra, Review of Revelation and Theology, in Calvin Theological Journal 21 [1986]: 127-130). In a more detailed critique, Colyer notes that Torrance's "soft foundationalism" includes both a place for intuition and the human freedom to believe (see Colyer, 78-80, n. 123). Colyer does not explain, however, how the juxtaposition of these two themes in Torrance's theology is resolved. Instead, Colyer merely makes repeated reference to one of the two juxtaposed themes, to clear statements by Torrance denying any truncation of human freedom in the process of knowing. Thiemann's problem, Colyer asserts, is that he did not read widely enough in Torrance's corpus, and therefore mistakenly "imported the foundationalist / antifoundationalist debate into his reading of Torrance. . . (Colyer, 80, n. 123). Oddly, David Tracy charges Torrance with being a strict coherentist (see David Tracy, "The Necessity and Insufficiency of Fundamental Theology" in Problems and Perspectives of Fundamental Theology, ed. René Latourrelle and Gerald O'Collins, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell [New York: Paulist Press, 1982], 30). David Cook in his New College dissertation also objected strongly to Torrance's appeal to intuition because it gives no ground for the critic. Edward David Cook, "The Use of Rationality in Religious and

Conclusion

In spite of all our queries, the scope and vigor of Torrance's development of anhypostasia and enhypostasia make it a tempting antithesis. With deepest respect, this author has felt the appeal and force of its attraction, as well as that of the Christian gentleman behind it. Reservations charitably expressed are an insult to neither, but rather a compliment of the highest order, for his work is taken with utmost seriousness and even genuine sentiment, in spite of a disagreement among Christian brothers.⁷¹

Torrance's doctrine of carnal union with Christ firmly roots Christ's mediation in his very constitution as God and man. In this way, the theological couplet behind it is foundational to Torrance's very powerful and persuasive doctrine of the vicarious humanity of Christ. For this reason alone carnal union is worthy of our interest. In this and a host of other ways, T. F. Torrance has secured high rank in the ongoing narrative of Scottish theology.

Metaphysical Argument" (Ph.D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 1973), 210.

⁷¹"In the early chapters of the book there is much controversy with such theologians as Karl Barth, Emil Brunner and Rudolf Bultmann, but it is friendly controversy, and indeed I am proud to number these three great theologians among my personal friends.'" John Baillie, Forward to the New Edition, in God Was in Christ: An Essay on Incarnation and Atonement, by D. M. Baillie (London: Faber and Faber, 1961), 7.

CONCLUSION

In any case, both Thomas F. Torrance's theology and the reader will be best served through striving at a faithful exposition of his theology in terms of its position, method, distinguishing features, and contribution. Robert J. Palma, "Thomas F. Torrance's Reformed Theology," Reformed Review 38 (1984): 2.

In this study, we have done the following:

1. Unfolded and clarified Torrance's doctrine of carnal union with Christ in the wider context of his christocentric dogmatics. This we have done paying close attention to the genetic development of this doctrine in his own thinking, as well as to the key insights on which it is based.
2. Examined the historical background to the doctrine of carnal union with Christ, focusing particularly upon Athanasius, Calvin and Barth.
3. Critiqued Torrance's doctrine of carnal union with Christ both internally and externally.

In addition, we have:

1. Shown how significant, even central, the doctrine of carnal union with Christ has been to Torrance's entire dogmatic program, particularly as it interfaces with other crucial christological themes, such as the fallen humanity of Christ, the unassumed is the unhealed, and the vicarious humanity of Christ.
2. Noted that previous studies of Torrance's positive theology have not addressed his doctrine of carnal union with Christ in the detail we have attempted here.

3. Suggested that some previous studies have failed adequately to examine Torrance critically.
4. Established that an awareness of the doctrine of carnal union with Christ in Torrance's theology helps clarify an unresolved dispute in Torrance studies over the role of the Holy Spirit and human response.
5. Clarified Torrance's relationship to three pivotal theologians--Athanasius, Calvin and Barth--as well as revealed his indebtedness to several others, such as R. W. Dale, F. D. Maurice, T. Carlyle, H. R. Mackintosh, P. T. Forsyth and Martin Luther.
6. Uncovered some important sources of information, in particular the 1938-1939 unpublished Auburn Seminary Lectures, the pre-1966 unpublished New College Lectures, and the correspondence between Torrance and Barth, which are critical for a comprehensive evaluation of Torrance's christocentric dogmatics.
7. Confirmed the important place Thomas Forsyth Torrance holds in the unfolding story of Scottish theology this century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Under their respective section and subsection headings, works by the same author are here arranged chronologically rather than alphabetically in order to facilitate our genetic study.

Primary Sources: T. F. Torrance

Books and Pamphlets

Torrance, T. F. The Modern Theological Debate. London: Theological Students' Prayer Union of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions, 1941.

_____. The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1948.

_____. Calvin's Doctrine of Man. London: Lutterworth Press, 1949.

_____. Kingdom and Church. London: Oliver & Boyd, 1956.

_____. When Christ Comes and Comes Again. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1957.

_____. Conflict and Agreement in the Church. Vol. 1. Order and Disorder. London: Lutterworth Press, 1959.

_____. The School of Faith: The Catechisms of the Reformed Church. London: James Clarke, 1959.

_____. Karl Barth: An Introduction to His Early Theology, 1910-1931. London: SCM Press, 1962.

_____. Theology in Reconstruction. London: SCM Press, 1965.

_____. Space, Time, and Incarnation. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.

_____. Theological Science. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.

_____. God and Rationality. London: Oxford University Press, 1971.

_____. Theology in Reconciliation: Essays towards Evangelical and Catholic Unity in East and West. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1975. Reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1976.

- _____. Space, Time and Resurrection. Edinburgh: Handsel Press, 1976.
- _____. Christ's Words. Jedburgh: Unity Press, 1980.
- _____. The Ground and Grammar of Theology. Belfast: Christian Journals, 1980.
- _____. Christian Theology and Scientific Culture. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- _____. Divine and Contingent Order. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- _____. Reality and Evangelical Theology. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982.
- _____. The Mediation of Christ. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1983.
- _____. Transformation and Convergence in the Frame of Knowledge. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1984.
- _____. The Christian Frame of Mind. Edinburgh: Handsel Press, 1985.
- _____. The Trinitarian Faith: The Evangelical Theology of the Ancient Catholic Church. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988.
- _____. The Hermeneutics of John Calvin. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1988.
- _____. Karl Barth: Biblical and Evangelical Theologian. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1990.
- _____. The Mediation of Christ. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1992.
- _____. Divine Meaning: Studies in Patristic Hermeneutics. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1995.
- _____. The Christian Doctrine of God, One Being Three Persons. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1996.
- _____. Scottish Theology: From John Knox to John McLeod Campbell. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1996.

Articles, Reviews, Works as Editor, Interviews

- Torrance, T. F. "Predestination in Christ." Evangelical Quarterly 13 (1941): 108-141.
- _____. "Theology and the Common Man." Life and Work 12 (1941): 177-178.

- _____. "The Place and Function of Reason in Christian Theology." Evangelical Quarterly 14 (1942): 22-41.
- _____. "Kierkegaard on the Knowledge of God." The Presbyterian 1 (1943): 4-7.
- _____. Review of Towards a Christian Philosophy, by Leonard Hodgson. Evangelical Quarterly 15 (1943): 237-239.
- _____. Review of The Apostolic Ministry: Essays on the History and Doctrine of Episcopacy. Edited by K. E. Kirk. Scottish Journal of Theology 1 (1948): 190-201.
- _____. "Concerning the Ministry." Scottish Journal of Theology 1 (1948): 184-206.
- _____. Review of The Oracles of God: An Introduction to the Preaching of John Calvin, by T. H. L. Parker. Scottish Journal of Theology 1 (1948): 212-214.
- _____. "Faith and Philosophy." The Hibbard Journal 47 (1948-49): 237-246.
- _____. Review of Catholicity. Scottish Journal of Theology 2 (1949): 87.
- _____. Review of The Letters of Saint Athanasius concerning the Holy Spirit, by C. R. B. Shapland. Scottish Journal of Theology 5 (1952): 205-208.
- _____. Review of The Fulness of Christ: The Church's Growth into Catholicity. Scottish Journal of Theology 5 (1952): 90-100.
- _____. "Where Do We Go From Lund?" Scottish Journal of Theology 6 (1953): 53-64.
- _____. "The Atonement and the Oneness of the Church." Scottish Journal of Theology 7 (1954): 245-269.
- _____. Review of Calvini Opera Selecta. Vol. II. Edited by Peter Barth and Dora Scheuner. Scottish Journal of Theology 7 (1954): 320-321.
- _____. "Introduction: The Place of Christology in Biblical and Dogmatic Theology." In Essays in Christology for Karl Barth. Edited by T. H. L. Parker. London: Lutterworth Press, 1956.
- _____. "The Place of the Humanity of Christ in the Sacramental Life of the Church." Church Service Society Annual 26 (1956): 129-34.
- _____. Introduction to The Mystery of the Lord's Supper: Sermons on the Sacrament Preached in the Kirk of Edinburgh by Robert Bruce in A.D. 1589 by

Robert Bruce. Edited and translated by T. F. Torrance. London: James Clarke, 1958.

_____. Introduction to Tracts and Treatises on the Reformation of the Church by John Calvin. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing, 1958.

_____. "Justification: Its Radical Nature and Place in Reformed Doctrine and Life." Scottish Journal of Theology 13 (1960): 225-246.

_____. "The Relevance of the Doctrine of the Spirit for Ecumenical Theology (Reply of Professor Thomas F. Torrance to his Critics)." World Alliance of Reformed Churches, Department of Theology, January 1964. Karl Barth-Archiv, Basel.

_____. "The Epistemological Relevance of the Holy Spirit." In Ex Auditū Verbi: Theologische Opstellen Aangeboden Aan Prof. Dr. G. C. Berkouwer. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1965.

_____. "Thomas Ayton's The Original Constitution of the Christian Church." In Reformation and Revolution, edited by Duncan Shaw. Edinburgh: St. Andrews Press, 1967.

_____. "The Hermeneutics of St. Athanasius." Ekklesiastikos Pharos (Alexandria), 52 (1970): 446-68.

_____. "The Hermeneutics of St. Athanasius." Ekklesiastikos Pharos (Alexandria), 53 (1971): 89-106 and 237-49.

_____. "The Mind of Christ in Worship: The Problem of Apollinarianism in the Liturgy." In Theology in Reconciliation: Essays Towards Evangelical and Catholic Unity in East and West. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1975.

_____, ed. Belief in Science and in Christian Life: The Relevance of Michael Polanyi's Thought for Christian Faith and Life. Edinburgh: Handsel Press, 1980.

_____. Introduction to The Incarnation: Ecumenical Studies in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed A.D. 381. Edited by T. F. Torrance. Edinburgh: Handsel Press, 1981.

_____. Review of Cyril of Alexandria: Select Letters. Edited and translated by Lionel R. Wickman. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 10, Department Orientalistiek, K. University Leuven, 1981.

_____. Letter to the Editor. Monthly Record of the Free Church of Scotland. May 1984.

- _____. ed. Theological Dialogue Between Orthodox and Reformed Churches.
Edinburgh and London: Scottish Academic Press, 1985.
- _____. ed. Theology and Science at the Frontiers of Knowledge. Vol. 1, Reality
and Scientific Theology, by T. F. Torrance. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic
Press, 1985.
- _____. "Karl Barth and the Latin Heresy." Scottish Journal of Theology 39 (1986):
461-482.
- _____. "My Interaction with Karl Barth." In How Karl Barth Changed My Mind.
Edited by Donald K. McKim. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- _____. "Karl Barth and Patristic Theology." In Theology Beyond Christendom.
Edited by John Thompson. Allison Park, PA: Pickwick Publications, 1986.
- _____. "The Goodness and Dignity of Man in the Christian Tradition." Modern
Theology (Oxford) 4 (July 1988): 309-22.
- _____. "The Soul and Person, in Theological Perspective." In Religion, Reason,
and the Self: Essays in Honour of Hywel D. Lewis. Edited by Stewart R.
Sutherland and T. A. Roberts. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1989.
- _____. Interview by author, 29 January 1990. Tape recording. Edinburgh.
- _____. "Calvin's Doctrine of the Trinity." In Calvin Theological Journal 25 (Nov
1990): 165-193.
- _____. "The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, Gregory Nazianzen and John Calvin."
Sobornost 12 (1990): 7-24.
- _____. "Karl Barth and the Latin Heresy." In Karl Barth, Biblical and Evangelical
Theologian. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1990.
- _____. "Incarnation and Atonement: Theosis and Henosis in the light of modern
scientific rejection of dualism." Address to the New College Student
Theological Society, 8 October 1991.
- _____. "The Christian Apprehension of God." In Speaking the Christian God: The
Holy Trinity and the Challenge of Feminism. Edited by A. F. Kimel, Jr. Grand
Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1992.
- _____. Royal Priesthood: A Theology of Ordained Ministry, 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T.
& T. Clark, 1993.
- _____. "The Atonement--The Singularity of Christ and the Finality of the Cross:

The Atonement and the Moral Order." In Universalism and the Doctrine of Hell. Edited by N. M. de S. Cameron. Carlisle and Grand Rapids, MI: Paternoster Press and Baker Book House, 1993.

_____. "The Doctrine of the Virgin Birth." Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology 12 (1994): 8-25.

_____. "The Truth of the Virgin Birth." Glasgow Herald, 14 January 1994, 11.

_____. "The Relevance of the Doctrine of the Spirit for Ecumenical Theology." World Alliance of Reformed Churches, Department of Theology, Geneva, n.d. Karl Barth-Archiv, Basel.

_____. "Itinerarium Mentis in Deum: T. F. Torrance--My Theological Development." Personal collection of T. F. Torrance, n.d. 18 pages.

Unpublished Auburn Seminary Lectures

The Christian Doctrine of Revelation (59 pages)

The Christian Doctrine of God with 12 short lectures (294 pages)

The Doctrine of Jesus Christ (351 pages)

Unpublished New College Lectures

TFT: Xeroxed Lectures (2 pages)

Outline of Lectures (6 pages)

Revelation and Religion (2 pages)

Scientific Dogmatics (4 pages)

Theses on Truth (3 pages)

Where is God? (7 pages)

The Old Israel and the Incarnation [excerpt from Conflict and Agreement, pp. 287-303] (9 pages)

Outline of the Doctrine of Christ (5 pages)

Jesus Christ the Servant-Son (9 pages)

The Once for All Union of God and Man in Christ (18 pages)

The Continuous Union in the Historical Life and Obedience of Jesus (13 pages)

The Life and Faithfulness of the Son Towards Man (16 pages)

The Mystery of Christ (15 pages)

The Hypostatic Union (8 pages)

The Patristic Doctrine of Christ (9 pages)

The Reformed Doctrine of Christ (10 pages)

The Kingdom of Christ and Evil (16 pages)

The Idea of Substitution in the Doctrine of the Atonement [by F. W. Camfield,

Scottish Journal of Theology 1, 1948] (1 page)
 The Understanding of Redemption in the Early Church (18 page)
 Historical Emphases in the Doctrine of Atonement (3 pages)
 The Idea of Substitution in the Doctrine of the Atonement [by F. W. Camfield] (6 pages)
 Atoning Justification (19 pages)
 The Priesthood of Christ (19 pages)
 The Priestly Aspect of Atonement (3 pages)
 Reconciliation (17 pages)
 Range of Redemption (13 pages)
 Eschatology (24 pages)
 The One Church of God (23 pages)
 The Doctrine of the Church (20 pages)
 Reconciliation in Christ and in His Church (6 pages)
 The One Baptism Common to Christ and His Church (21 pages)
 The Place of Water in the Theology and Practice of Baptism in the Church of Scotland (4 pages)
 A Neglected Aspect of the Doctrine of Baptism (45 pages)
 The Paschal Mystery of Christ and the Eucharist (18 pages)
 The Paschal Mystery of Christ and the Eucharist: General Theses (4 pages)
 The Christian Doctrine of Marriage (8 pages)
 Service in Jesus Christ (12 pages)
 Lawful Ministry and Ordination in the Church of Scotland (12 pages)
 Elders (4 pages)
 Ecumenism (7 pages)
 Toward an Ecumenical Consensus on the Trinity (14 pages)
 The Quicunque vult or 'Athanasian Creed' (1 page)

Primary Sources: Other

Athanasius

Athanasius. Select Treatises of St. Athanasius in Controversy with the Arians Freely Translated. Vol. II. Translated by John Henry Newman. London: Pickering and Co., 1881.

_____. Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione. Translated and edited by Robert W. Thomson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

_____. Ad Adelphium. Edited by Archibald Robertson. In A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, second series, Vol. IV, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978.

_____. Ad Epictetum. Edited by Archibald Robertson. In A Select Library of

Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, second series, Vol. IV, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978.

Contra Gentes. Edited by Archibald Robertson. In A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, second series, Vol. IV, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978.

De Incarnatione Verbi Dei. Edited by Archibald Robertson. In A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, second series, Vol. IV, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978.

Orationes Contra Arianos. Edited by Archibald Robertson. In A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, second series, Vol. IV, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978.

John Calvin

Calvin, John. Sermons of Maister Iohn Caluin, vpon the Booke of Iob. Translated by Arthur Golding. London: Thomae Woodcocke, 1574.

Ioannis Calvini Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia. Vols. 1-62. Edited by G. Baum, E. Cunitz, and E. Reuss. In Corpus Reformatorum, vols. 29-85. Brunsvigae: C. A. Schwetschke et Filium, 1863-1897.

Calvin: Theological Treatises. Translated and edited by J. K. S. Reid. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1954.

The Gospel According to John 1-10. Edited by D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance. Translated by T. H. L. Parker. Edinburgh: St. Andrew Press, 1959.

The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians. Edited by D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance. Translated by J. W. Fraser. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1960.

The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians. Edited by D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance. Translated by R. Mackenzie. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1960.

Institutes of the Christian Religion (1559 edition). 2 vols. Edited by J. T. McNeill. Translated by F. L. Battles. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1960.

The Gospel According to John 11-21 and the First Epistle of John. Edited by D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance. Translated by T. H. L. Parker. Edinburgh: St. Andrew Press, 1961.

The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews and the First and Second Epistles of St. Peter. Edited by D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance. Translated by W. B. Johnston. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1963.

The Second Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians and the Epistles to Timothy, Titus and Philemon. Edited by D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance. Translated by T. A. Smail. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964.

The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians. Edited by D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance. Translated by T. H. L. Parker. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1965.

A Harmony of the Gospels Matthew, Mark and Luke. Vol. 1. Edited by D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance. Translated by A. W. Morrison. Edinburgh: St. Andrew Press, 1972.

A Harmony of the Gospels Matthew, Mark and Luke. Vol. 2. Edited by D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance. Translated by T. H. L. Parker. Edinburgh: St. Andrew Press, 1972.

A Harmony of the Gospels Matthew, Mark and Luke. Vol. 3. Edited by D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance. Translated by A. W. Morrison. Edinburgh: St. Andrew Press, 1972.

Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews. Translated by John Owen. Vol. 22, Calvin's Commentaries Series. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1972.

Sermons on the Epistle to the Ephesians. Translated by Arthur Golding. Reprint. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1973.

Commentary on Genesis. Translated by John King. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1979.

Selected Works of John Calvin: Tracts and Letters. 7 vols. Edited by Henry Beveridge and Jules Bonnet. Translated by M. R. Gilchrist. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1983.

The Sermons of Maister Iohn Vpon the Fifth Booke of Moses Called Deuteronomie. Translated by Arthur Golding. London: Henry Middleton, 1583. Reprint. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1987.

- _____. Commentaries on the First Book of Moses Called Genesis. Translated by John King. 2 vols. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society. Reprint, Calvin's Commentaries Series. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1989.
- _____. Commentaries on the Last Four Books of Moses Arranged in the Form of a Harmony. 4 vols. Translated by C. W. Bingham. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society. Calvin's Commentaries Series. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1989.
- _____. Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets. Translated by John Owen, 5 vols. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society. Reprint, Calvin's Commentaries Series. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1989.
- _____. Commentary on the Book of Psalms. Vol. 1. Translated by J. Anderson. Vol. 4, Calvin's Commentaries Series. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1989.
- _____. Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Isaiah. Vol. 1. Translated by W. Pringle. Vol. 7, Calvin's Commentaries Series. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1989.
- _____. Calvin's Ecclesiastical Advice. Translated by M. Beaty and B. W. Farley. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991.
- _____. "Sermon on I Corinthians 11:2-3." Men, Women, and Order in the Church. Translated by Seth Skolnitsky. Dallas, TX: Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1992.

Karl Barth

- _____. The Epistle to the Romans. 6th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- _____. "Die Grundformen des theologischen Denkens." Evangelische Theologie 3 (1936): 462-472.
- _____. "The Basic Forms of Theological Thought." Expository Times 49 (1937/38): 5-8.
- _____. The Knowledge of God and the Service of God According to the Teaching of the Reformation: Recalling the Scottish Confession of 1560, being the Gifford Lectures delivered in the University of Aberdeen in 1937 and 1938. Translated by J. L. M. Haire and Ian Henderson. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938.
- _____. Die Kirchliche Dogmatik. I/2. Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1945.

- _____. "The Real Church." Scottish Journal of Theology 3 (1950): 337-351.
- _____. "Christus and Adam nach Römer 5." Theologische Studien 5. Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag A. G. Zollikon, 1952.
- _____. Church Dogmatics. Vol. I/2. Edited by G.W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. T. & T. Clark, 1956.
- _____. Church Dogmatics. Vol. IV/1. Edited by G.W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. T. & T. Clark, 1956.
- _____. Church Dogmatics. Vol. II/1. Edited by G.W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. T. & T. Clark, 1957.
- _____. Church Dogmatics. Vol. II/2. Edited by G.W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. T. & T. Clark, 1957.
- _____. Church Dogmatics. Vol. III/1. Edited by G.W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. T. & T. Clark, 1958.
- _____. Church Dogmatics. Vol. IV/2. Edited by G.W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. T. & T. Clark, 1958.
- _____. Church Dogmatics. Vol. III/2. Edited by G.W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. T. & T. Clark, 1960.
- _____. Church Dogmatics. Vol. III/3. Edited by G.W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. T. & T. Clark, 1960.
- _____. Church Dogmatics. Vol. III/4. Edited by G.W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. T. & T. Clark, 1961.
- _____. Church Dogmatics. Vol. IV/3/first half. Edited by G.W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. T. & T. Clark, 1961.
- _____. Church Dogmatics. Vol. IV/3/second half. Edited by G.W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. T. & T. Clark, 1962.
- _____. Christ and Adam: Man and Humanity in Romans 5, In Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers 5. Translated by T. A. Smail. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1963.
- _____. Karl Barth's Tabletalk. In Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers 10. Edited by John D. Godsey. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1963.
- _____. The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism. Translated by Ernest A.

Payne. London: SCM Press, 1963.

_____. Learning Jesus Christ Through the Heidelberg Catechism. Translated by S. C. Guthrie, Jr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.

_____. God, Grace and Gospel. In Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers 8. Translated by J. S. McNab. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1966.

_____. The Humanity of God. Translated by J. N. Thomas and T. Wieser. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1967.

_____. Church Dogmatics. Vol. IV/4 (fragment). Edited by G.W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. T. & T. Clark, 1969.

_____. Church Dogmatics. Vol. I/1. Edited by G.W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. T. & T. Clark, 1975.

_____. Witness to the Word: A Commentary on John 1. Edited by Walther Fuerst. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.

_____. The Göttingen Dogmatics: Instruction in the Christian Religion. Edited by Hannelotte Reiffen. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

Secondary Sources

Achtner, W. "Physik, Mystik und Christentum: Eine Darstellung und Diskussion der natürlichen Theologie bei T. F. Torrance." Ph.D. diss., University of Heidelberg, 1990.

Agnew, M. B. "The Concept of Sacrifice in the Eucharistic Theology of Donald M. Baillie, Thomas F. Torrance, and Jean-Jacques Von Allmen." Ph.D. diss., Catholic University of America, 1972.

Alston, William P. "Has Foundationalism Been Refuted?" Philosophical Studies 29 (1976): 287-305.

_____. "Two Types of Foundationalism." The Journal of Philosophy 73 (1976): 165-185.

Anderson, M. W. "Peter Martyr, Reformed Theologian (1542-1562): His letters to Heinrich Bullinger and John Calvin." Sixteenth Century Journal 4 (1973): 41-64.

_____. "Peter Martyr on Romans." Scottish Journal of Theology 26 (1973): 401-

- _____. Peter Martyr: A Reformer in Exile (1542-1562). Nieuwkoop: B. De Graaf, 1975.
- Aquinas, Thomas. Summa Theologiae. Vol. 48. Translated and edited by R. J. Hennessey. New York: McGraw-Hill/Blackfriars, 1964.
- Aulén, Gustav. Reformation and Catholicity. Translated by Eric H. Wahlstrom. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1962.
- Baillie, D. M. God Was in Christ. London: Faber and Faber, 1948.
- Barbour, G. F. The Life of Alexander Whyte, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1924.
- Barbour, Ian G. Myths, Models and Paradigms: The Nature of Scientific and Religious Language. London: SCM Press, 1974.
- Barr, James. The Semantics of Biblical Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- _____. Biblical Faith and Natural Theology. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Barth, Markus. "Current Discussion on the Political Character of Karl Barth's Theology." In Footnotes to a Theology: the Karl Barth Colloquium of 1972, edited by Martin Rumscheidt. Canada: Corporation for the Publication of Academic Studies in Religion in Canada, 1974.
- Bavinck, Herrman. Philosophy of Revelation. London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1909.
- Bebbington, D. Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s. London: Unwin Hyman, 1989.
- Bell, M. Charles. Calvin and Scottish Theology: The Doctrine of Assurance. Edinburgh: Handsel Press, 1985.
- Benoit, Jean-Daniel. Calvin and His Letters. Translated by R. Haig. Vol. 5 of Courtenay Studies in Reformation Theology. Oxford: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1991.
- Berkhof, H. Review of Theology in Reconstruction, by T. F. Torrance. Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift 20 (1966): 298-300.
- Beza, Theodore. Correspondance de Théodore de Bèze. Vol. 1. Edited by F. Aubert

- and H. Meylan. Geneva: Libraire E. Droz, 1960.
- Black, Max. Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1962.
- Boumann, Michael. Roundtable: Conversations with European Theologians. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1990.
- Bray, Gerald. Creeds, Councils and Christ. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1984.
- British Library General Catalogue of Printed Books to 1975. Vol. 296. London: K.G. Saur, 1985.
- Bromiley, Geoffrey W. "Karl Barth." In Creative Minds in Contemporary Theology. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966.
- _____. Introduction to the Theology of Karl Barth. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979.
- _____. "The Reformers and the Humanity of Christ." Perspectives on Christology: Essays in Honor of Paul K. Jewett. Edited by M. Shuster and R. Muller. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1991.
- Brown, Colin. Review of Space, Time and Incarnation, by T. F. Torrance. The Churchman 85 (1971): 219-229.
- Bruce, A. B. The Humiliation of Christ in its Physical, Ethical, and Official Aspects: The Sixth Series of the Cunningham Lectures. 5th ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1900.
- Brunner, Emil. The Mediator: A Study of the Central Doctrine of the Christian Faith. Translated by Olive Wyon. London and Redhill: Lutterworth Press, 1934.
- Brunner, Emil, and Karl Barth. Natural Theology. Translated by P. Fraenkel. London: Geoffrey Bles, The Centenary Press, 1946.
- Burkhart, John E. "The Holy Spirit and Polemics: A Response to Professor Torrance." World Alliance of Reformed Churches, Department of Theology, [Geneva, 11 July 1963]. Karl Barth-Archiv, Basel.
- Busch, Eberhard. Karl Barth: His Life from Letters and Autobiographical Texts. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
- Campbell, Ian. "Thomas Carlyle." Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology. Edited by N. M. de S. Cameron, D. F. Wright, D. C. Lachamn, and D. E. Meek. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993.

- Campbell, J. McLeod. The Nature of the Atonement and its Relation to Remission of Sins and Eternal Life. London: Macmillan and Co., 1915.
- Candlish, James. The Christian Salvation: Lectures on the Work of Christ--Its Appropriation and Its Issues. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899.
- Carlyle, Thomas. "Hero as Priest: Luther; Reformation: Knox; Puritanism." In Heroes and Hero Worship. Vol. 14 of The Works of Thomas Carlyle. Centennial Memorial Edition. Boston: Dana Estes & Company, 1892.
- Chadwick, Henry. The Calcedonian Definition: Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Early Church. Hampshire: Variorum, 1991.
- Christensen, Torben. The Divine Order: A Study in F. D. Maurice's Theology. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.
- Clements, Keith W. Review of Karl Barth, Biblical and Evangelical Theologian, by T. F. Torrance. Expository Times 103 (1991): 28-29.
- Coates, N. J. "Some Implications of M. Polanyi's Concept of Personal Knowledge for Theological Method, with Special Reference to T. F. Torrance." M.A. thesis, University of Wales, 1982.
- Colwell, John. Actuality and Provisionality: Eternity and Election in the Theology of Karl Barth. Edinburgh: Rutherford House, 1989.
- Colyer, E. M. "The Nature of Doctrine in the Theology of T. F. Torrance." Ph.D. diss., Boston College, 1992.
- Creed, John Martin. "Recent Tendencies in English Christology." In Mysterium Christi: Christological Studies By British and German Theologians. Edited by G. K. A. Bell and D. Adolf Deissmann. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1930.
- Cupitt, Don. Review of Theological Science and Space, Time and Incarnation, by T. F. Torrance. Church Quarterly 2 (1970): 262-264.
- Dale, A. W. W. Life of R. W. Dale. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1899.
- Dale, R. W. The Atonement: The Congregational Union Lecture for 1875. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1878. Reprint, London: Congregational Union of England and Wales, 1905.
- Daley, Brian E. "'A Richer Union': Leontius of Byzantium and the Relationship of Human and Divine in Christ". Studia Patristica 24 (1993): 239-265.
- _____. "The Origenism of Leontius of Byzantium." Journal of Theological Studies,

27 (1976): 333-369.

_____. "Leontius of Byzantium: A Critical Edition of His Works, with Prolegomena." Ph.D. diss., University of Oxford, 1978.

Denney, James. The Death of Christ. New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1911.

Dickie, John. The Organism of Christian Truth: A modern positive dogmatic. London: James Clarke, 1931.

Diem, Hermann. "Karl Barth as a Socialist: Controversy Over a New Attempt to Understand Him." In Karl Barth and Radical Politics. Edited by George Hunsinger. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976.

Dods, Marcus. On the Incarnation of the Eternal Word. London: R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1831.

Donnelly, J. P. Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of Man and Grace. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

Donnelly, J. P., R. M. Kindgon, and M. W. Anderson. A Bibliography of the Works of Peter Martyr Vermigli. Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1990.

Dowey, E. A., Jr. The Knowledge of God in Calvin's Theology. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1965.

Dragas, George D. Athanasiana: Essays in the Theology of Saint Athanasius. London: no publisher, 1980.

_____. St. Athanasius Contra Apollinarem. With an introduction by T. F. Torrance. Church and Theology. Vol. 6. Athens: Church and Theology, 1985.

Encyclopedia of the Early Church. Vol. 1. Edited by Angelo Di Berardino. Translated by Adrian Walford. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Engel, M. P. John Calvin's Perspectival Anthropology. In No. 52, American Academy of Religion Series, edited by Susan Thistlethwaite. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988.

Evenson, George O. "Critique of Aulen's Christus Victor." Concordia Theological Monthly 28 (1957): 738-749.

Expository Times 26 (October 1914): 38-9.

Fairbairn, Andrew Martin. "Dale as a Theologian." In Life of R. W. Dale by A. W. W.

- Dale. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1899.
- Fairweather, Eugene R. "Incarnation and Atonement: An Anselmian Response to Aulen's Christus Victor." Canadian Journal of Theology 7 (1961): 167-175.
- Farley, Benjamin W. Review of John Calvin's Perspectival Anthropology, by Mary Potter Engel. Theology Today 45 (1991): 508.
- Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae. Vol. IX. Edinburgh (1961).
- Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae. Vol. X. Edinburgh (1981).
- Feenstra, Ronald J. Review of Revelation and Theology. Calvin Theological Journal 21 (1986): 127-130.
- Ferguson, Everett, ed. Encyclopedia of Early Christianity. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1990.
- Fielder, Geraint. Lord of the Years. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988.
- Finke, Anne-Kathrin. Karl Barth in Großbritannien: Rezeption und Wirkungsgeschichte. Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener Verlag, 1995.
- Finlayson, R. A. "Reformed Theological Writings." The Monthly Record of the Free Church of Scotland (November 1996): 241.
- Ford, David F. Review of Trinitarian Faith, by T. F. Torrance. Scottish Journal of Theology, 43 (1990): 263-267.
- Forsyth, P. T. The Person and Place of Jesus Christ. The Congregational Union Lecture for 1909. London: Congregational Union of England and Wales and Hodder and Stoughton, 1909.
- Franks, R. S. The Work of Christ: A Historical Study of Christian Doctrine. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1962.
- Frei, Hans W. "The Doctrine of Revelation in the Thought of Karl Barth, 1909 to 1922: The Nature of Barth's Break with Liberalism." Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1956.
- Geerard, M. Clavis Patrum Graecorum. Vol. 2. Turnhout: Brepols, 1974.
- George, Timothy. Theology of the Reformers. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1988.
- Gerrish, B. A. Review of School of Faith, by T. F. Torrance. Church History 29 (1960): 364.

- _____. Reformers in Profile. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1967.
- _____. Tradition and the Modern World: Reformed Theology in the Nineteenth Century. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- _____. Grace and Gratitude: The Eucharist Theology of John Calvin. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993.
- Glare, P. G. W., ed. Oxford Latin Dictionary. Vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- Gorham, G. C., ed. Gleanings of a Few Scattered Ears. London: Bell and Daldy, 1857.
- Gorringer, T. J. "Not Assumed is Not Healed: The Homousion and the Liberation Theology." Scottish Journal of Theology 3 (1985): 481-490.
- Gray, Brian. "Bibliography of the Published Writings of Thomas F. Torrance (1941-1975)." Creation Christ and Culture: Studies in Honour of T. F. Torrance. Edited by R. W. A. McKinney. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1976.
- Gray, B. J. A. "Theology as Science: An Examination of the Theological Methodology of Thomas F. Torrance." S.Th.D. diss., Katholieke Universiteit, Louvain, 1975.
- Gregory, Thomas. "Union to Christ the Ground of Justification." Opening and Closing Addresses to the New College Theological Society, Session 1882-83. Edinburgh: Lorimer & Gillies, 1883, 33-50.
- Grensted, L. W. A Short History of the Doctrine of the Atonement. Manchester: The University Press, 1920.
- Grillmeier, Aloys. Christ in Christian Tradition. Vol. 1. Translated by J. S. Bowden. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1965.
- _____. Christ in Christian Tradition. Vol 2. Translated by John Cawte and Pauline Allen. London: Mowbray, 1995.
- Gunton, Colin. "Christus Victor Revisited: A Study in Metaphor and the Transformation of Meaning." Journal of Theological Studies 36 (1985): 129-145.
- Guthridge, I. N. "Revelation and Reconciliation in Christ: The Christology of T. F. Torrance." Ph.D. diss., Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, Rome, 1967.
- Guthridge, Joannes. The Christology of T. F. Torrance: Revelation and Reconciliation in Christ. Melbourne: Society of St. Paul, 1967.
- Hanson, R. P. C. The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God. Edinburgh: T. & T.

- Clark, 1988.
- Hardy, Daniel W. "Thomas F. Torrance." In The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology in the Twentieth Century. Vol. 1. Edited by David F. Ford. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.
- Harink, D. K. "Theology as Science: An Exposition and Evaluation of the Thought of Thomas Forsyth Torrance." Master of Christian Studies thesis, Regent College, Vancouver, 1979.
- Harnack, Adolf von. History of Dogma. Vol. IV. Translated by Neil Buchanan. New York, NY: 1961.
- Hart, Trevor. "Two Models of Salvation in Relation to Christological Understanding in the Patristic East." Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1989.
- _____. Review of In the Likeness of Sinful Flesh: An Essay on the Humanity of Christ, by Thomas G. Weinandy. Scottish Journal of Theology 49 (1996): 254-255.
- Hauk, Wilhelm-Albert. "Sünde" and "Erbsünde" Nach Calvin. Heidelberg: Evangelischer Verlag Jakob Comtesse, 1939.
- Hebblethwaite, B. L. The Problems of Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Hendry, George S. The Gospel of the Incarnation. London: SCM Press, 1959.
- Heppe, Heinrich. Reformed Dogmatics. Translated by G. T. Thomson. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1950.
- Herrmann, Wilhelm. The Communion of the Christian with God: Described on the Basis of Luther's Statements. Edited by R. W. Stewart. Translated by J. Sandys Stanyon. Third English edition. London: Williams & Norgate, 1909.
- Hesselink, I. John. "A Pilgrimage in the School of Christ - An Interview with T. F. Torrance." Reformed Review 38 (1984): 49-64.
- Holmes, Michael W., ed. The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations of their Writings. 2nd edition. "An Ancient Christian Sermon [II Clement]." Edited and translated by J. B. Lightfoot and J. R. Harmer. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1992.
- Hooker, Morna D. From Adam to Christ: Essays on Paul. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

- Hong, Wong Wing. "An Appraisal of the Interpretation of Einsteinian Physics in T. F. Torrance's Scientific Theology." Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1994.
- Horne, J. S. The Story of Castle Church, Stafford. Gloucester: British Publishing Company, 1963.
- Hunsinger, George, ed. Karl Barth and Radical Politics. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976.
- _____. How to Read Karl Barth. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- "Interim Report of the Special Commission on Baptism." In Minutes of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, May 1958.
- "Interim Report of the Special Commission on Baptism." Karl Barth-Archiv, Basel, May 1956.
- James, Frank A., III. "A Late Medieval Parallel in Reformation Thought: *Gemina Praedestinatio* in Gregory of Rimini and Peter Martyr Vermigli." In Via Augustini: Augustine in the Latter Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Reformation; essays in honor of Damasus Trapp. Edited by H. A. Oberman and F. A. James III in cooperation with E. L. Saak. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991.
- Jansen, J. F. Calvin's Doctrine of the Work of Christ. London: James Clarke, 1956.
- Jayne, Sears. Library Catalogues of the English Renaissance. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1956.
- Jenkins, Michael. Love is of the Essence. Edinburgh: St. Andrews Press, 1993.
- John of Damascus. Exposition of the Orthodox Faith. Vol. 9. In Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989.
- Johnson, Harry. The Humanity of the Saviour: A Biblical and Historical Study of the Human Nature of Christ in Relation to Original Sin, with Special Reference to its Soteriological Significance. London: The Epworth Press, 1962.
- Kang Phe Seng. "The Concept of the Vicarious Humanity of Christ in the Theology of Thomas Forsyth Torrance." Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1983.
- _____. "The Epistemological Significance of Homoousion in the Theology of Thomas F. Torrance." Scottish Journal of Theology 45 (1992): 341-366.
- Kannengiesser, Charles. "Athanasius and Traditional Christology." Theological Studies 34 (1973): 103-113.

- _____. "Athanasius of Alexandria *Three Orations Against the Arians*: A Reappraisal." *Studia Patristica* 17 (1982): 981-995.
- _____. "Current Theology, The Athanasian Decade 1974-84: A Bibliographical Report." *Theological Studies* 46 (1985): 524-541.
- _____. "Athanasius' So-Called Third Oration Against the Arians." unpublished paper.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by Norman Kemp Smith. London: Macmillan, 1929.
- Katz, Steven Z. "The Language and Logic of Mystery in Christology." In *Christ, Faith and History: Cambridge Studies in Christology*. Edited by S. W. Sykes and J. P. Clayton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Kehm, George H. "The Christological Foundation of Anthropology in the Theology of Karl Barth." Th.D. diss., Harvard University, 1966.
- _____. "Comment on 'The Relevance of the Doctrine of the Spirit for Ecumenical Theology,' a paper by Prof. Thomas F. Torrance (Edinburgh)." World Alliance of Reformed Churches, Department of Theology, Geneva. 3 July 1963. Karl Barth-Archiv, Basel.
- Kelly, J. N. D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. 5th ed. London: A & C Black, 1977.
- _____. *The Oxford Dictionary of Popes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Kennedy, H. A. A. *The Theology of the Epistles*. London: Duckworth and Company, 1923.
- Kernohan, R. D. "Tom Torrance: The Man and the Reputation." *Life and Work* (May 1976): 14-16.
- Kettler, C. D. "The Vicarious Humanity of Christ and the Reality of Salvation." Ph.D. diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 1986.
- _____. *The Vicarious Humanity of Christ*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1991.
- Kingdon, R. M. *The Political Thought of Peter Martyr Vermigli*. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1980.
- Kirby, R. "The Theological Definition of Cosmic Disorder In the Writings of Thomas Forsyth Torrance." Ph.D. diss., University of London, 1992.

- Klinefelter, Donald S. "God and Rationality: A Critique of the Theology of Thomas F. Torrance." Journal of Religion 53 (1973): 133.
- Koedyker, John C. Review of The Vicarious Humanity of Christ and the Reality of Salvation, by C. D. Kettler. Reformed Review 45 (1992): 253-254.
- Kolfhaus, W. Christusgemeinschaft bei Johannes Calvin. Vol. 3, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Lehre der Reformierten Kirche. Neukirchen: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1939.
- Kruger, C. Baxter. "Participation in the Self-Knowledge of God: The Nature and Means of our Knowledge of God in the Theology of T. F. Torrance." Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1989.
- _____. "The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God in the Theology of T. F. Torrance." Scottish Journal of Theology 43 (1990): 366-389.
- Krusche, Werner. Das Wirken des Heiligen Geistes nach Calvin. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957.
- Lampe, G. W. H. A Patristic Greek Lexicon. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Lane, A. N. S. Review of John Calvin's Perspectival Anthropology, by Mary Potter Engel. Themelios 16 (1991): 21-22.
- Lane, Tony. "The Quest for the Historical Calvin." Evangelical Quarterly 60 (1983): 95-113.
- Lee, Jung Young. "Karl Barth's Use of Analogy in his Church Dogmatics." Scottish Journal of Theology (1969) 22: 2, 129-151.
- Leedham-Green, E. S. Books in Cambridge Inventories: Book-Lists from Vice-Chancellor's Court Probate Inventories in the Tudor and Stuart Periods. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Leith, John H. John Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1989.
- Loewe, William P. "Irenaeus' Soteriology: Christus Victor Revisited." Anglican Theological Review 67 (1985): 1-15.
- Loofs, Friedrich. Leontius von Byzanz und die gleichnamigen Schriftsteller der griechischen Kirche. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1887.
- Louth, A. "Athanasius' Understanding of the Humanity of Christ." Studia Patristica 16 (1985): 309-318.

- Lumley, W. "Analogy in a Theological Setting." Ph.D. diss., Queens University, Belfast, 1977.
- Lunt, Ronald. Review of Theology in Reconciliation, by T. F. Torrance. Expository Times 87 (1976): 379.
- Luther, Martin. "A Safe Stronghold Our God is Still." Translated by Thomas Carlyle. Church Hymnary. Edited by James Moffatt. 2nd ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1928.
- _____. "Ein feste Berg ist unser Gott." D. Martin Luthers Werke. Vol. 35. Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Weimarer Ausgabe. Weimar: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger, 1923. Reprint, Graz: Akademische Druke und Verlagsanstalt, 1964.
- Lyman, Rebecca J. Christology and Cosmology: Models of Divine Activity in Origen, Eusebius and Athanasius. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Mackintosh, H. R. Some Aspects of Christian Belief. London: Hodder and Stoughton, no date.
- _____. The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1913.
- Macleod, Donald. "Christology." Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology. Edited by N. M. de S. Cameron, D. F. Wright, D. C. Lachamn, and D. E. Meek. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993.
- _____. "The Doctrine of the Incarnation in Scottish Theology: Edward Irving." Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology 9 (1991): 42-47.
- Macquarrie, John. "Anhypostasia and Enhypostasia: Two Elusive Concepts." Paper Delivered to the 14th International Conference on Patristic Studies. Oxford, 19-23 August, 1991.
- Marley, Alan G. T.F. Torrance in a Nutshell. Nutshell Series no. 4. Edinburgh: Handsel Press, 1992.
- Marshall, Bruce. Christology in Conflict: The Identity of a Saviour in Rahner and Barth. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987.
- Marquardt, Friedrich-Wilhelm. "Socialism in the Theology of Karl Barth." In Karl Barth and Radical Politics. Edited by George Hunsinger. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976.
- McClelland [sic], J. C. "The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination." Scottish Journal of

Theology 8 (1955): 255-271.

McCormack, Bruce L. "A Scholastic of a Higher Order: The Development of Karl Barth's Theology, 1921-31." Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1989.

_____. "For Us and Our Salvation: Incarnation and Atonement in the Reformed Tradition." Studies in Reformed Theology and History 1 (Spring 1993): 1-38.

_____. Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology: Its Genesis and Development 1909-1936. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

McDonnell, Kilian. John Calvin, the Church, and the Eucharist. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967.

McGrath, Alister E. Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification. Vol. 2, From 1500 to the Present Day. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

_____. Review of The Hermeneutics of John Calvin, by T. F. Torrance. Evangelical Quarterly 62 (1990): 191-2.

McIntyre, John. St. Anselm and His Critics: A Re-Interpretation of the *Cur Deus Homo*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1954.

_____. Christian Doctrine of History. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.

_____. The Shape of Christology. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966.

McLean, Stuart D. Humanity in the Thought of Karl Barth. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1981.

McLelland, J. C. "The Doctrine of the Sacraments in the Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli (A.D. 1500-1562)." Ph.D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 1953.

_____. The Visible Words of God. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.

_____. "Calvinism Perfecting Thomism?: Peter Martyr Vermigli's Question." Scottish Journal of Theology 31 (1978): 571-578.

_____. "Peter Martyr Vermigli: Scholastic or Humanist?" Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian Reform. Edited by J. C. McLelland. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1980.

McNair, P. Peter Martyr in Italy. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1967.

- McPake, John L. "H. R. Mackintosh, T. F. Torrance and the Reception of the Theology of Karl Barth in Scotland - With Particular Reference to the Concept of the Self-Revelation of God." Ph.D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 1994.
- Meardon, B. H. "A Study of Space, Time and Incarnation in the Work of T. F. Torrance." M.Phil. thesis, Oak Hill College, 1984.
- Meijering, E. P. Orthodoxy and Platonism in Athanasius: Synthesis or Antithesis? Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968.
- Meyendorff, John. Christ in Eastern Christian Thought. Washington, DC: Corpus Books, 1969. Reprint, Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1975.
- Miller, J. B. "Beyond Dualism: Cosmological Issues for Christian Theology in a Post-Modern, Post-Critical Cultural Context." Ph.D. diss., Marquette University, 1986.
- Miller, John. Was Christ in Adam? 3rd ed. Princeton, NJ: Evangelical Reform Publication, 1887.
- Milner, Benjamin C. Calvin's Doctrine of the Church. Vol. 5 of Studies in the History of Christian Thought. Edited by H. A. Oberman. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.
- "Minutes of Meetings of Edinburgh University New College Theological Society." Call number AA.3.1.14. New College Archives, Edinburgh.
- "Minutes of the Faculty of Divinity of Edinburgh University and the Senate of New College." Call number AA.1.2.5. New College Archives, Edinburgh.
- Morrison, John D. Review of Trinitarian Faith, by T. F. Torrance. Calvin Theological Journal 25 (1990): 119-121.
- Mozley, John Kenneth. The Doctrine of the Atonement. London: Duckworth & Co., 1915.
- _____. "Christology and Soteriology." In Mysterium Christi: Christological Studies By British and German Theologians. Edited by G. K. A. Bell and D. Adolf Deissmann. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1930.
- Muller, Richard A. Christ and the Decree. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1986.
- _____. "Directions in the Study of Barth's Christology." Westminster Theological Journal 48 (1986): 119-134.
- Murray, John. The Imputation of Adam's Sin. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1959.

- _____. The Epistle to the Romans. Part 1. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1967.
- Needham, Nicholas R. "Appendix V: The Historical Pedigree of Edward Irving's Christology." In Thomas Erskine of Linlathen: His Life and Theology, 1788-1837. Edinburgh: Rutherford House Books, 1990.
- New College Library Lending Ledgers. New College Archives AA 2.1.95 through AA 2.1.97. New College Archives, Edinburgh.
- Newell, R. J. "Participatory Knowledge: Theology as Art and Science in C. S. Lewis and T. F. Torrance." Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1983.
- Nevin, John W. The Mystical Presence. Philadelphia, PA: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1846.
- Nichols, James Hastings, ed. The Mercersburg Theology. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Niesel, W. The Theology of Calvin. Translated by H. Knight. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1956.
- _____. Reformed Symbolics. Translated by D. Lewis. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1962.
- Noble, T. A. "Thomas F. Torrance." New Dictionary of Theology. Edited by S. B. Ferguson and D. F. Wright. Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988.
- _____. "Thomas Forsyth Torrance." Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology. Edited by N. M. de S. Cameron, D. F. Wright, D. C. Lacham, and D. E. Meek. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993.
- O'Carroll, Michael. Trinitas, A Theological Encyclopedia of the Holy Trinity. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1987.
- The Oxford English Dictionary. Vol. 8. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1970.
- Pailin, David A. The Anthropological Character of Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Palma, Robert J. "Thomas F. Torrance's Reformed Theology." Reformed Review 38 (1984): 2-46.
- Pannenberg, Wolfhart. Jesus--God and Man. London: SCM Press, 1968.
- _____. An Introduction to Systematic Theology. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans,

1991.

_____. Systematic Theology. Vol. 2. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

Parker, T. H. L. Karl Barth. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970.

_____. Review of Grace and Gratitude: The Eucharistic Theology of John Calvin, by B. A. Gerrish. Journal of Theological Studies 45 (1994): 771-775.

_____. Calvin: An Introduction to his Thought. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1995.

Partee, Charles. "Calvin's Central Dogma Again." Sixteenth Century Journal 18 (1987): 191-199.

_____. "Calvin, Calvinism, and Philosophy: A Prolusion." Reformed Review 33 (Spring 1980): 129-135.

_____. Review of John Calvin's Perspectival Anthropology, by Mary Potter Engel. Journal of Religion 69 (1989): 553-554.

Patrologia Latina Database. Rel. 4 [CD-ROM]. Alexandria, VA: Chadwyck-Healey, 1995.

Peebles, Bernard M., ed. The Fathers of the Church. Introduction to Saint John of Damascus: Writings. Translated by Frederic H. Chase, Jr. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1970.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. The Christian Tradition. Vol. 1. The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

_____. The Christian Tradition. Vol. 4, Reformation of Church and Dogma (1300-1700). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Perrone, L. "Leontius of Byzantium." Encyclopedia of the Early Church. Vol. 1. Edited by Angelo D. Berardino. Translated by Adrian Walford. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Peters, Ted. "The Atonement in Anselm and Luther: Second Thoughts About Gustaf Aulen's Christus Victor." Lutheran Quarterly 24 (1972): 301-314.

Pettersen, Alvyn. Athanasius. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1995.

Plantinga, Alvin. "Is Belief in God Rational?" In Rationality and Religious Beliefs. Edited by C. F. Delaney. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press,

1979.

_____. Warrant: The Current Debate. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

"Prebendary Melville Scott." Times (London), 16 April 1929.

"Protokollbuch für das Dogmatische Seminar über Das Problem der natürlichen Theologie, W. S. 1937/38." Karl Barth-Archiv, Basel.

Quasten, J. Patrology. Vol. 3. Utrecht: Spectrum, 1960.

Quinn, James. Review of Theology in Reconstruction, by T. F. Torrance. Theological Studies 28 (1967): 388-390.

Raitt, Jill. Review of John Calvin's Perspectival Anthropology, by Mary Potter Engel. Sixteenth Century Journal 21(1990): 324-325.

Ramsey, Ian T. Models and Mystery. The Whidden Lectures for 1963. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Rankin, W. Duncan. "Thomas Forsyth Torrance." Twentieth-Century Dictionary of Christian Biography. Edited by J. D. Douglas. Grand Rapids, MI and Carlisle, England: Baker Books and Paternoster Press, 1995.

Rashdall, Hastings. The Idea of the Atonement in Christian Theology. Bampton Lectures for 1915. London: Macmillan, 1919.

_____. The Christology of St. Athanasius. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1930.

Redman, Robert R., Jr. "The Christ of the Cross: The Person and Work of Jesus Christ in the Theology of H. R. Mckintosh." Ph.D. diss., University of Erlangen, 1989 [revised 1992].

_____. "Participatio Christi: H. R. Mackintosh's Theology of the Unio Mystica." Scottish Journal of Theology 49 (1996): 202-203.

"The Relevance of the Doctrine of the Spirit for Ecumenical Theology." World Alliance of Reformed Churches, Department of Theology, Geneva, November 1963. Karl Barth-Archiv, Basel.

Relton, H. M. A Study in Christology: The Problem of the Relation of the Two Natures in the Person of Christ. London: SPCK, 1917.

Richards, Jay W. "Can a Male Saviour Save Women?: Gregory of Nazianzen on the Logos' Assumption of Human Nature." November 1996. The Evangelical

Theological Society Annual Conference, Jackson, Mississippi (USA).

Richardson, K. A. "Trinitarian Reality: The Interrelation of Uncreated and Created Being in the Thought of Thomas Forsyth Torrance." Ph.D. diss., University of Basel, 1991.

_____. Trinitarian Reality: The Interrelation of Uncreated and Created Being in the Thought of Thomas Forsyth Torrance. Wake Forrest, NC: The Ethne Group, 1993.

Ritschl, Dietrich. Athanasius, Versuch einer Interpretation. Theologische Studien. Zurich: EVZ-Verlag, 1964.

Roberts, Richard H. A Theology on Its Way?: Essays on Karl Barth. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991.

Robertson, L. G. "The Relationship Between Incarnation and Atonement in the Theology of T. F. Torrance." M.Th. thesis, Australian College of Theology, 1990.

Robinson, J. Armitage. "The Meaning of Homooousios in the Constantinopolitan Creeds: Ephraim's Quotations From the Gospel Codex i of the Gospels and its Allies a Study of Ambrosiaster." In Texts and Studies, Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature. Vol VII. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Rodger, Symeon. "The Soteriology of Anselm of Canterbury, An Orthodox Perspective." Greek Orthodox Theological Review 34 (1989): 19-43.

Rosato, Philip J. The Spirit as Lord: The Pneumatology of Karl Barth. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1981.

Rousseau, G. S. "Science Books and Their Readers in the Eighteenth Century." Books and Their Readers in Eighteenth-Century England. Edited by I. Rivers. Leicester and New York, NY: Leicester University Press and St. Martin's Press, 1982.

Rupprecht, Johannes. Hermann Bezzel als Theologe. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1925.

Sansom, D. L. "Scientific Theology: An Examination of the Methodology of Thomas Forsyth Torrance." Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1981.

Scott, David A. Review of Trinitarian Faith, by T. F. Torrance. Anglican Theological Review 73 (1991): 214-216.

"Scott, Sir George Gilbert." Dictionary of National Biography. Vol. 17. Edited by Sidney Lee. London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1909.

Scott, Melville. The Force of Love. Derby: Bemrose & Sons, 1899.

_____. The Harmony of the Collects, Epistles and Gospels: Being a devotional exposition of the continuous teaching of the Church throughout the year. London: Bemrose & Sons, 1902.

_____. The Harmony of the Proper Psalms for the Fasts and Festivals of the Church Year: A Devotional Exposition. London: Bemrose & Sons, 1905.

_____. Crux Crucis: the problem of the atonement. Harrogate: R. Ackrill, 1907.

_____. The Atonement. London: George Allen & Sons, 1910.

_____. The Christian Covenant. London: George Allen & Sons, 1912.

_____. Athanasius on the Atonement. Stafford: J. & C. Mort Ltd., 1914.

_____. "Preaching the Doctrine of the Atonement." Expository Times 25 (June 1914): 428-429.

_____. The Message of Hosea. London: SPCK, 1921.

_____. Textual Discoveries in Proverbs, Psalms, and Isaiah. London: SPCK, 1927.

"Scott, Melville." Crockford's Clerical Directory for 1925. London: Oxford University Press, 1925.

"Scott, Melville." Who Was Who 1929-1940. Vol. III. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1941.

Scott, Thomas. The Force of Truth. 1779. Reprint, Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1984.

"Scott, Thomas." The Imperial Dictionary of Universal Biography. Vol. 3, division 16. London: William Mackenzie, no date.

"Scott, Thomas." Dictionary of National Biography. Vol. 17. Edited by Sidney Lee. London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1909.

Seeberg, Reinhold. History of Doctrines. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1954.

Siemens, David F., Jr. "Two Problems with Torrance." Perspectives on Science and

Christian Faith 43 (1991): 112-113.

Smail, T. A. Review of The Mediation of Christ, by T. F. Torrance. Scottish Journal of Theology 38 (1985): 241-244.

_____. The Giving Gift: The Holy Spirit in Person. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1988.

Smeaton, George. Christ's Doctrine of the Atonement. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1871.

Smith, Gerrit. Review of God and Rationality, by T. F. Torrance. Theological Studies 32 (1971): 514.

Stamps, R. J. "'The Sacrament of the Word Made Flesh': The Eucharistic Theology of Thomas F. Torrance." Ph.D. diss., St. John's College, Nottingham, 1986.

Stead, G. Christopher. "Rhetorical Method in Athanasius." Vigiliae Christianae 30 (1976): 127-137.

_____. Divine Substance. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

_____. "Individual personality in Origen and the Cappadocian Fathers." In U. Bianchi and H. Crouzel, ed., Arche e Telos: L'antropologia di Origene di Gregorio di Nissa: Analisi storico-religiosa. Studia Patristica Mediolanensia 12 (1981): 170-191, 192-196.

_____. Substance and Illusion in the Christian Fathers. London: Variorum Reprints, 1985.

Stewart, J. S. A Man in Christ. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.

Stoeffler, F. Ernest German Pietism During the Eighteenth Century. Vol. 24 of Studies in the History of Religions (Supplements to Numen). Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.

Sturch, Richard. The Word and the Christ. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Suiceri, Johannes Caspari. Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus, E Patribus Graecis Ordine Alphabetico. Vol. 1. Amsterdam: R. & J. Wetstenious and Gul. Smith, 1728.

Sykes, S. W. "Theology through History." In The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology in the Twentieth Century. Vol. II. Edited by David F. Ford. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.

Tamburello, Dennis E. "Christ and Mystical Union: A Comparative Study of the Theologies of Bernard of Clairvaux and John Calvin." Ph.D. diss., University of

Chicago, 1990.

_____. Union with Christ: John Calvin and the Mysticism of St. Bernard.
Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994.

Taylor, A. E. Aristotle. New York: Dover, 1955.

Thiemann, R. F. Revelation and Theology. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1985.

Thompson, John. Christ in Perspective: Christological Perspectives in the Theology of Karl Barth. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.

Thunberg, Lars. Man and the Cosmos: the Vision of St. Maximus the Confessor.
Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985.

Torrance, Iain R. Christology after Chalcedon: Severus of Antioch and Sergius the Monophysite. Norwich: The Canterbury Press Norwich, 1988.

_____. "A Bibliography of the Writings of Thomas F. Torrance 1941-1989."
Scottish Journal of Theology 43 (1990): 225-262.

Torrance, J. B. "The Priesthood of Jesus: A Study in the Doctrine of the Atonement."
In Essays in Christology for Karl Barth, edited by T. H. L. Parker. London:
Lutterworth Press, 1956.

_____. "The Vicarious Humanity of Christ." In The Incarnation: Ecumenical Studies in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed A.D. 381, edited by T. F. Torrance. Edinburgh: Handsel Press, 1981.

_____. Introduction to The Nature of the Atonement, by J. McLeod Campbell.
Edinburgh and Grand Rapids, MI: Handsel Press and Eerdmans, 1995.

Tracy, David. "The Necessity and Insufficiency of Fundamental Theology." In
Problems and Perspectives of Fundamental Theology, edited by René
Latourrelle and Gerald O'Collins. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell. New
York: Paulist Press, 1982.

Trook, D. A. "The Unified Christocentric Field: Toward a Time-Eternity Relativity
Model for Theological Hermeneutics in the Onto-Relational Theology of
Thomas F. Torrance." Ph.D. diss., Drew University, 1986.

Tucker, Robert P. Review of The Mediation of Christ, by T. F. Torrance. Theological Studies 45 (1984): 769.

Tuttle, George M. So Rich a Soil: John McLeod Campbell on Christian Atonement.

Edinburgh: Handsel Press, 1986.

Twombly, Charles C. "The Nature of Christ's Humanity: A Study in Athanasius." Patristic and Byzantine Review 8 (1989): 227-241.

Tylenda [sic], Joseph. "Christ the Mediator: Calvin versus Stancaro." Calvin Theological Journal 8 (1973): 5-16.

Tylenda, Joseph N. "The Controversy on Christ the Mediator: Calvin's Second Reply to Stancaro." Calvin Theological Journal 8 (1973): 131-157.

University and New College Edinburgh Faculty of Divinity Handbook: Session 1934-1935. Call number AA.1.16.1. New College Archives, Edinburgh.

University and New College Edinburgh Faculty of Divinity Handbook: Session 1935-1936. Call number AA.1.16.1. New College Archives, Edinburgh.

University and New College Edinburgh Faculty of Divinity Handbook: Session 1936-1937. Call number AA.1.16.1. New College Archives, Edinburgh.

University and New College Edinburgh Faculty of Divinity Handbook: Session 1941-1942. Call number AA.1.16.1. New College Archives, Edinburgh.

Van Buren, Paul. Christ in Our Place. Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.

"Verbatim Minutes of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland." Office of the Principal Clerk, Church of Scotland.

Vermigli, Peter Martyr. Common Places of the most famous and renowned Divine Doctor Peter Martyr, divided into foure principall parts, with Appendix. Translated by Anthony Marten. London: H. Denham and H. Middleton, 1583.

_____. Loci Communis Petri Martyris Vermilii Florentini Theologi Celeberrimi. Geneva: Pierre Aubert, 1627.

Vidler, Alec R. The Theology of F. D. Maurice. London: SCM Press, 1948.

Vogel, C. J. De. "Platonism and Christianity: A Mere Antagonism or a Profound Common Ground?" Vigiliae Christianae 39 (1985): 1-62.

Vogel, Heinrich. Das Wort ward Fleisch: Ein Kapitel aus der Christologie, München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1936.

_____. Gott in Christo: Ein Erkenntnisgang durch die Grundprobleme der Dogmatik, Berlin: Lettner-Verlag, 1951.

- Wallace, R. S. Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1953.
- _____. Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1959.
- Wardlaw, Harry. "Theology: Art or Science?" In God, Secularization, and History: Essays in Memory of Ronald Gregor Smith. Edited by Eugene Thomas Long. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1974.
- Warfield, B. B. The Person and Work of Christ. Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishers, 1950.
- Webster, J. B. "The Christian in Revolt: Some Reflections on *The Christian Life*." In Reckoning with Barth: Essays in Commemoration of the Centenary of Karl Barth's Birth, edited by Nigel Biggar. London: Mowbray, 1988.
- _____. Review of The Trinitarian Faith, by T. F. Torrance. Themelios 16 (1990): 32.
- Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield, MA: G. & C. Merriam, 1977.
- Wendel, F. Calvin: Origins and Development of His Religious Thought. Translated by P. Mairet. New York, NY: Harper and Row, 1963.
- Wendel, Francois. Calvin: Origins and Development of His Religious Thought. Durham, NC: The Labyrinth Press, 1987.
- Wiles, M. F. "The Unassumed is the Unhealed." Religious Studies 4 (1968): 47-56.
- Williams, D. D. Interpreting Theology 1918-1952. London: SPCK Press, 1955.
- Williams, G. H. The Radical Reformation. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1962.
- Williams, Trevor. Review of Karl Barth, Biblical and Evangelical Theologian, by T. F. Torrance. New Blackfriars 73 (1992): 462-464.
- Willis, David. Calvin's Catholic Christology. Vol. 2 of Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought. Edited by H. A. Oberman. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966.
- Willis-Watkins, D. "The Unio Mystica and the Assurance of Faith According to Calvin." In Calvin: Erbe und Auftrag, Festschrift for W. H. Neuser, edited by Willem van't Spijker. Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1991.
- Wright, David F. Review of Theological Dialogue between Orthodox and Reformed Churches, edited by T. F. Torrance. Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology 6 (1988): 40-41.

_____. "George Thomas Thomson." In Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology. Edited by N. M. de S. Cameron, D. F. Wright, D. C. Lachman, and D. E. Meek. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993.

Yeung, Hing Kau. "Being and Knowing: An Examination of T. F. Torrance's Christological Science." Ph.D. diss., University of London, 1994.

Yob, Iris M. "Religious Metaphor and Scientific Model: Grounds for Comparison." Religious Studies 28 (1992): 475-485.

Young, David. F. D. Maurice and Unitarianism. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Young, Frances M. From Nicea to Chalcedon, a Guide to the Literature and Its Background. London: SCM Press Limited, 1983.

APPENDIX 1

THE LIFE AND WORK OF T. F. TORRANCE

Who is T. F. Torrance?¹ Born the son of missionary parents on 30 August 1913 in Szechwan, China, Thomas Forsyth Torrance was educated at Edinburgh (1931-1937) under Norman Kemp Smith (1872-1958), A. E. Taylor (1869-1945), John Macmurray (1891-1976), H. R. Mackintosh (1870-1936), G. T. Thomson (1887-1958), William Manson (1882-1958), and John Baillie (1886-1960). Post-graduate

¹This brief description of Torrance's life and work, except obviously for the last sentence, was developed by this author and presented to Professor Torrance on 7 May 1993 for his review before an edited version of it was published as W. Duncan Rankin, "Thomas Forsyth Torrance" in Twentieth-Century Dictionary of Christian Biography, ed. J. D. Douglas (Grand Rapids, MI and Carlisle, England: Baker Books and Paternoster Press, 1995), 390. See also Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae, vol. IX (Edinburgh, 1961), 775-776 and vol. X (Edinburgh, 1981), 432-433; T. A. Noble, "Thomas F. Torrance," in New Dictionary of Theology, ed. S. B. Ferguson and D. F. Wright (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988), 690-691; R. J. Palma, "Thomas F. Torrance's Reformed Theology," Reformed Review 38 (1984): 2-46; I. John Hesselink, "A Pilgrimage in the School of Christ--An Interview with T. F. Torrance," Reformed Review 38 (1984): 49-64; T. A. Noble, "Thomas Forsyth Torrance," Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology, ed. N. M. de S. Cameron, D. F. Wright, D. C. Lacham, and D. E. Meek (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993), 823-824; and R. D. Kernohan, "Tom Torrance: The Man and the Reputation," Life and Work (May 1976): 14-16. Two records of the same interview were also consulted. On 1 March 1991, Professor Torrance was interviewed in his Edinburgh home by reporter John Macleod. Both Professor Torrance and John Macleod kindly provided me with their own transcripts of this interview. Also, Professor Torrance kindly provided me a draft copy of an early chapter of the autobiography he is drafting: T. F. Torrance, "Itinerarium Mentis in Deum: T. F. Torrance--My Theological Development," unpublished manuscript, personal collection of T. F. Torrance, 18 pages.

studies under Karl Barth in Basel (Winter 1937-Summer 1938) were cut short by Torrance's appointment as Professor of Systematic Theology at Auburn Theological Seminary in New York (1938-1939). After further studies at Oxford (1939-1940) and service as both a parish minister and an active-duty chaplain, Torrance completed his doctoral studies on the Apostolic Fathers at Basel in 1946. He was inducted as Professor of Church History at New College, Edinburgh in 1950, but transferred in 1952 into his preferred Hauptfach of theology and the Chair of Christian Dogmatics.

Torrance's command of historical and theological topics was extended by the demands of early key projects--founding and editing the Scottish Journal of Theology (1948-1981), serving on the WCC Faith and Order Commission (1952-1962), convening the Church of Scotland's Special Commission on Baptism (1953-1962), and co-editing English translations of Barth's Church Dogmatics (1956-1975) and Calvin's New Testament Commentaries (1959-1972). Co-editing these works by Barth and Calvin, Torrance spurred interest in these two theologians, while at the same time influencing a generation of scholars through his own subsequent treatments.

During his early career, Torrance completed studies on Calvin's anthropology, Reformation eschatology, Barth's early theology, and Scottish studies. His early work Calvin's Doctrine of Man (1949) was the first major study of the Reformer's anthropology. His analysis of Barth's early theology in Karl Barth: An Introduction to His Early Theology, 1910-1931 (1962) is still appreciated for its stress on revelational objectivism.² Along with his writings in Scottish theology--such as translating Robert

²George Hunsinger, How to Read Karl Barth (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 9-12.

Bruce's sacramental sermons (1958) and editing a collection of Reformed catechisms under the title The School of Faith (1959)--Torrance's early works sought to promote wider scholarly interest in this area, counter the influence of both Liberalism and Westminster Calvinism in his native land, and provide an objective basis for wider theological dialogue. Torrance's treatment of the biblical text draws heavily upon Kittel's Theologische Wortbuch and William Manson's depth exegesis, which has been in turn attacked by James Barr and defended by Morna Hooker.³

Moderator of the Church of Scotland's General Assembly in 1976, Torrance was awarded the 1978 Templeton Foundation Prize for Progress in Religion. He has continued to speak and write extensively since his retirement from teaching in 1979. Torrance has written some thirty books and authored or edited over 500 other publications, covering Patristic, Medieval, Reformation, Scottish, and Modern Theology, as well as biblical studies, philosophy, and modern science.⁴

The breadth of Torrance's scholarly interaction is due to his keen intellect and sustained interaction with Barth's theology. Barth invigorates all he does. There Torrance found the central vision that animates his work--the incarnate Word of God

³For example, on Torrance's treatment of πίστις Χριστοῦ, compare James Barr, The Semantics of Biblical Language (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961), 161-205 and Morna D. Hooker, From Adam to Christ: Essays on Paul (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 165-186.

⁴For a fine, extensive bibliography of Torrance's work through 1989, see Iain R. Torrance, "A Bibliography of the Writings of Thomas F. Torrance 1941-1989," Scottish Journal of Theology 43 (1990): 225-262. To correct a number of omissions and errors in the above bibliography, compare it with Brian Gray, "Bibliography of the Published Writings of Thomas F. Torrance (1941-1975)" in Creation Christ and Culture: Studies in Honour of T. F. Torrance, ed. R. W. A. McKinney (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1976), 307-321; and Kruger, 335-357.

as the objective scientific basis of dogmatics. This key insight informs Torrance's biblical scholarship, energizes his historical studies (particularly in Athanasius, Calvin, and Scottish theology), grounds his ecumenical dialogue (notably with the Orthodox), and demarcates his polemics (against Roman Catholicism, Westminster Calvinism, Liberalism, and biblical criticism).

Best known for his work on science and theology, Torrance applies his key insight to parallels between theological and scientific method in his Theological Science (1969). Controlled by the object of study, the thought of both scientist and theologian avoids "damaging dualisms" that divide fact and meaning. Thus, Torrance posits a thoroughly scientific role for personal faith, classic dogmas, and the Bible, all with the persuasive imprimatur of post-Einsteinian science.

Torrance's key insight is not abandoned in his more positive theology. Drawing heavily from Greek and other Patristic sources, The Trinitarian Faith (1988) develops the trinitarian and christological doctrines of perichoresis, homousion, anhypostasia, and enhyposstasia from this objective basis, while The Mediation of Christ (1986, 1992) does the same more popularly. Through his formulation of "the vicarious humanity of Christ," Torrance highlights the need to reconcile Christ's incarnation and atonement, life and death, using a more Eastern ontological model rather than a more Western forensic one. More recently, his attention has turned more profoundly to the doctrine of the Trinity in Trinitarian Perspectives: Toward Doctrinal Agreement (1994) and The Christian Doctrine of God, One Being Three Persons (1996).

APPENDIX 2

MATERIALS ON T. F. TORRANCE IN THE NEW COLLEGE ARCHIVES

In addition to important information on T. F. Torrance contained in the regular New College Library collection--such as his own writings, the dissertations of the post-graduate students he supervised, and the annual editions of the Edinburgh University Calendar--the New College Archives, housed in the New College Library, contains a wealth of interesting information on Torrance. These materials are of several kinds.

The Faculty Minute Book

The "Minutes of the Faculty of Divinity of Edinburgh University and the Senate of New College" is held in the New College Archives.¹ This document contains records of the awards and prizes won by Torrance, as well as his grades and a notation of his addition to the Faculty in 1950.

On 17 May 1935, Torrance won the Junior Prize in Church History.² On 29 November 1935, he was awarded the Blackie Scholarship for study in Athens and

¹"Minutes of the Faculty of Divinity of Edinburgh University and the Senate of New College," call number AA.1.2.5, New College Archives, Edinburgh.

²"Minutes of the Faculty of Divinity of Edinburgh University and the Senate of New College," call number AA.1.2.5, New College Archives, Edinburgh, 15.

Jerusalem.³ On 16 March 1937, Torrance was awarded the Waterbeck Prize for Senior Divinity, the College Prize for Practical Theology, and the Mackintosh Prize for Elocution. He also tied for overall top student at New College with an average of 85.⁴ On 10 June 1937, the New College Faculty Senate voted to grant T. F. Torrance the Bachelor of Divinity degree with distinction in Systematic Theology and awarded him the Aitken Fellowship, which made his post-graduate studies on the Continent possible.⁵

The University and New College Faculty of Divinity Handbooks

Copies of the University and New College Faculty of Divinity Handbook are held in the New College Archives.⁶ These documents record information on the New College Faculty, Libraries, Divinity Students' Committee, and Societies, as well as student addresses.

The handbook for 1934-1935 has little more than Torrance's name and the address of his flat on Warrender Park Road.⁷ The handbook for 1935-1936, however, testifies to Torrance's keen interest in missions. He is listed as a Superintendent of

³"Minutes of the Faculty of Divinity of Edinburgh University and the Senate of New College," call number AA.1.2.5, New College Archives, Edinburgh, 24.

⁴"Minutes of the Faculty of Divinity of Edinburgh University and the Senate of New College," call number AA.1.2.5, New College Archives, Edinburgh, 47.

⁵"Minutes of the Faculty of Divinity of Edinburgh University and the Senate of New College," call number AA.1.2.5, New College Archives, Edinburgh, 49.

⁶This set of handbooks is located at call number AA.1.16.1, New College Archives, Edinburgh.

⁷University and New College Edinburgh Faculty of Divinity Handbook: Session 1934-1935, call number AA.1.16.1, New College Archives, Edinburgh, 13.

Pleading General Office Bearer for the student Missionary Society, and was scheduled to speak to the Society on 7 November 1935 on "Missionary Work in China."⁸ In the handbook for 1936-1937, Torrance's involvement appears to shift from missions to theology. Torrance is listed as one of the two Junior Presidents of the New College Theological Society of that year, while Karl Barth is listed as the Honorary President.⁹ Torrance himself was the Honorary President of the New College Theological Society in the 1941-1942 academic year and was scheduled to address the Society on "The Place and Function of Reason in Christian Theology."¹⁰

Minutes of the New College Theological Society

The "Minutes of Meetings of Edinburgh University New College Theological Society" are also held in the New College Archives.¹¹ This document also lists T. F. Torrance as one of the two Junior Presidents of the Society.¹² It also gives a very interesting extract minute from the first occasion on which T. F. Torrance met Karl Barth! The extract reads as follows:

⁸University and New College Edinburgh Faculty of Divinity Handbook: Session 1935-1936, call number AA.1.16.1, New College Archives, Edinburgh, 6 and 7.

⁹University and New College Edinburgh Faculty of Divinity Handbook: Session 1936-1937, call number AA.1.16.1, New College Archives, Edinburgh, 7.

¹⁰University and New College Edinburgh Faculty of Divinity Handbook: Session 1941-1942, call number AA.1.16.1, New College Archives, Edinburgh, 8. This address was later published: T. F. Torrance, "The Place and Function of Reason in Christian Theology," Evangelical Quarterly 14 (1942): 22-41.

¹¹"Minutes of Meetings of Edinburgh University New College Theological Society," call number AA.3.1.14, New College Archives, Edinburgh.

¹²"Minutes of Meetings of Edinburgh University New College Theological Society," call number AA.3.1.14, New College Archives, Edinburgh, 134.

The Library Hall
New College
19 March 1937

At which place and on which date a meeting of the Society was held at 8 P.M. The business of the evening was the Address of the Honorary President Karl Barth who was introduced by Professor Curtis, who was in the chair. The subject of the address was "Forms of Theological Thinking." Professor Barth who spoke in German dealt with the nature and object of theological thinking and with the relationship between Jesus Christ and the Word of God. His address was translated at intervals by Mr. Ian Henderson. At the close of the address, the vote of thanks was given by the President of the Society, Mr Mc Ewen. The vote of thanks to the chairman, Prof. Curtis, was proposed by Mr. Macartney. Both these votes of thanks were heartily accorded by the large distinguished audience which had assembled. Thereafter the meeting was closed with the benediction.

A. Kernohan, Vice President
David F. S. Dick, Secretary¹³

New College Library Lending Ledgers

A final quite interesting set of items in the New College Archives are the old New College Library Lending Ledgers.¹⁴ These items had been lost in the stacks of the Archives until research for this study uncovered them. While the first of these volumes pre-dates Torrance, the last two ledgers are of interest.

The following entries under the name of T. F. Torrance are taken from the New College Library Borrowing Ledgers held in the New College Archives. The

¹³"Minutes of Meetings of Edinburgh University New College Theological Society," call number AA.3.1.14, New College Archives, Edinburgh, 162. According to Hinrich Stoevesandt of the Karl Barth-Archiv in Basel, the German text of this address was previously printed as Karl Barth, "Die Grundformen des theologischen Denkens," Evangelische Theologie 3 (1936): 462-472. An English summary of the address was later printed as Karl Barth, "The Basic Forms of Theological Thought," Expository Times 49 (1937/38): 5-8.

¹⁴These ledger books have call numbers AA 2.1.95, AA 2.1.96, and AA 2.1.97, New College Archives, Edinburgh.

entries are typed as best they appear, including any errors introduced by the library staff when they copied Torrance's original entry from temporary daily sheets into the Library Registers. The foreign titles are especially difficult to read and doubtless have many mistakes. The quality of entries varies greatly, depending upon the shade of ink and condition of the page.

New College Archives Call Number AA 2.1.96

Page 18

1934

Oct	23	Sands: Literary Genius of N.T.	09	Nov
	23	Farrer: Message of the Books	04	Dec
	23	Alexander: Leading Ideas of the Gospels	09	Nov
	23	Balmforth: St. Luke (Clarendon Bible)	09	Nov
	30	Gregory: Why Four Gospels	04	Nov
Nov	08	Turner: Essentials of Dev. of Religion	03	Dec
	09	Lyman: Meaning of Truth of Religion	13	Nov
	09	A. L. Lilley: Religion and Revelation	13	Nov
	13	W. P. Paterson: Rule of Faith	29	Nov
	16	Taylor: Faith of a Moralist I	22	Nov
	22	Stewart: Freedom of Authority	29	Nov
	22	Heugenga: Authority	03	Nov

1935

Jan	10	Augustine: City of God	06	Feb
	10	Harnack: History of Dogma V	06	Feb
	10	Morgan: Psychological Teaching of Augustine	06	Feb
	11	Sttley: Augustine's Confession	14	Jan
	14	Moulsomers: St. Augustine	06	Mar
	14	Augustine: Solioguses	04	Feb
	16	Augustine: Short Treatises	06	Mar
	18	Cavel: Rev. of Theol. among Gk. Phil. vol. 2	05	Feb
Feb	05	I.C.C.: St. Mark	03	Sep
	21	Skuner: Isaiah	14	Mar
	21	Cent. Bible: St. Mark	14	Mar
Mar	01	Jahuda: Accuracy of the Bible	01	May

06	Shreelen: Four Gospels	06	Mar
06	Barchelh: Original Jesus	06	Mar
06	Manson: Christ. View of Kingdom of God	16	Mar
06	Driver: Introduction to Literature of OT	16	Mar

New College Archives Call Number AA 2.1.96

Page 71

	07	Leal: Christian Faith in Early Ireland	14	Mar
	14	Master: New Knowledge about the NT	01	May
	14	Duncan: Digging Up Rock, Hist. I	03	Sep
	14	Budge: Babylonian Life and History	19	Mar
	14	Cook: Religion of the Palistine	19	Mar
	14	Gastaney: The Land of the Hordes	19	Mar
	14	Landon: The Epic of Creation	19	Mar
	15	Carpenter: Supernatural Religion	14	May
	19	Calvin: Inst. of the Chr. Rel. V.I+II	01	Oct
	19	Smith: Religion of the Semites	01	Oct
	19	Lods: Israel	03	May
May	01	Lindsay: Kant	03	Sep
	03	Swete: Mark	03	Jun
	14	Barth: Resurrection	03	Sep
	14	Temple: Nature and God	03	Sep
	17	Ritschl: Justification and Revelation	14	Jun
Jun	05	Appleyard: Greek Church	14	Jun
	05	Hare: Greek Church	14	Jun
	05	Bavink: Phil. of Religion	16	Jun
	05	Kennedy: Theology of Gospels	16	Jun
	05	Clarke: Ideas of Apostle Paul	16	Jun
	05	Machen: St. Paul's Religion	16	Jun
	05	Eusebius: Church History, 2 vols.(Loeb)	01	Oct
	05	Hunt & Eadger: Select Papyri 2 vols. (Loeb)	01	Oct
	05	Bullock: Clement of Alexandria (Loeb)	01	Oct

New College Archives Call Number AA 2.1.96

Page 92

Oct	14	Thumb. Handbook of Greek Vernacular	14	Jan
	14	Moullon: Proleg. to Greek Grammar of NT	18	Oct
	14	Dessman: Light from Ancient East	15	Oct
	14	Expo. Grk Text: Acts Corinthians	16	Oct
	14	Perry: 1 Corinthians Greek	15	Oct

	14	Edwards: 1 Corinthians Greek	16	Jan
	14	Anderson Scott: Christianity of St. Paul	22	Jan
	14	Kennedy: 1 & 2 Samuel	22	Jan
	14	Shepherd: Theology of NT	17	Nov
	15	Cooke: Judge & Ruth (Cent. Bible)	27	May
	15	Cooke: Joshua (Cent. Bible)	06	Nov
	16	Skinner: Prophecy + Religion	06	Nov
	18	Wobberman: Nature of Religion	16	Jan
Nov	11	Gardner: Interpretation of Religion Exp	04	Dec
	11	Kuros: Dogma + Religion	04	Dec
Dec	04	Ross: Cross of Christ	04	Dec
	04	Strong: Theology v. I	04	Dec
	04	Herm: Spirit and Truth	06	Dec
	10	Lake: Evlad Epistles of Paul	16	Jan
	16	Gastang: Heritage of Solomon	14	Jan
	16	Brooke: Omga on St. John's Gospel	03	Mar
	16	Robertson: Athanasius De Incarnatione	16	?
	16	Lahn: Introduction to NT vol. 3	09	?
	16	Manson: Incarnate Glory	10	?
	20	Pau: Idea of God and Israel	14	?

1936

Jan	21	Davidson: Theology of OT	14	?
	22	Brunner: Word & World	14	?
	22	Brunner: Theology of Crisis	28	?
	23	Harnack: Conclusion of Christianity	16	?
	23	Ayer: Source Book for Brist Ch History	09	?
	24	Robison: Conversion of Europe	12	?
Feb	17	Baillie: Life Everlasting	25	?
	17	Barth & Thurneyson: God's Search for Man	09	?
	19	McLaren: Christ's Musti	20	Feb
	20	Leckie: Waved to Course	08	?
	28	Skinner: Cent. Bible Israel vol I	08	Mar
Mar	16	Welch: Prepare for Lehst + OT	19	?
Nov	27	Moffat: The Approach to NT	?	?
Dec	01	Webb: Problems in the Relation of Lockmann	18	Dec
	02	Bultmann: Jesus and the Cross	04	Dec
	02	Stephen: Christian Ethics	?	?
	09	Hunter: The Teaching of Calvin	29	?
	18	Unetadyen: Isa.	12	Jan
	18	Usanebma: Isa.	12	Jan
	18	Bede: Eccl. Hist.	12	Jan

1937

Jan	14	Pulpit Commentary vol. I	18	Jan
	19	Newman: St. Athanasius II	29	?
	19	Athanasius: Die Incarnazione	29	?
	22	Athanasius on the Atonement	29	?
Feb	01	Streeter: Concerning Prayer	?	?
	01	Aquinas: On Grace	?	?
	03	von Seigel: Essays . . .	?	?
	10	Kuyper: Calvinism	?	?
	10	Hunter: The Teaching of Calvin	?	?
	13	Calvin: John	?	?

New College Archives Call Number AA 2.1.96

Page 102

Mar	05	Herm: Spirit and Truth	?	?
	12	Harnack: History of Dogma v. VII	?	?
	12	Maffert: History of Christian Thought	?	?
	12	Oman: Problems of Truth and Freedom	06	May
	16	Crenisted: Person of Christ	06	May
	16	Pleederk: The Phil. of Xian Rel. vol. I	27	May
	16	Stansfed: Atonement in History and Life	06	May
Apr	15	Workman: Xian Thought and the Reformation	06	May

1938

Mar	02	Harnack: History of Dogma vol. I + II	?	?
	04	McEven: Greek Christian Literature	08	Mar
	04	Meanes: St. Paul and the Anti-Nicene Church	11	Mar
	11	Moody: The Mind of the Early Church	?	?
	11	Mackinnon: Gospel in the Early Church	15	Mar
	11	Clarke: 1st Epistle of Clement to Cor.	?	?
	16	Hatch: Hibbert Lectures, 1888	?	?
	16	Donaldson: Hist. of Xian Lit + Doct	?	?
	17	The Doctrine of Grace	?	?
	17	dAuncy: Doctrine of Grace	?	?
	17	Cunningham: Epist of Barnabas	?	?
	17	Kirk: The Vision of God	?	?
	18	Carrington: Xian Apologetics of the 2nd C.	?	?
	29	Bauer: Richteglaubgkeit und Kelgrche	?	?
	29	Wigger: Augustunean + Relagamrin	?	?
	30	J Martyr (Donaldson): H of Xian Lit and Doct	27	Jul
Jul	27	Gavin: Greek Orthodox Thought	02	Sep

27	Erglbnedt: Das clvistensthrum Justus	02	Sep
27	Beunst: The Apologies of Justin Martyr	02	Sep
27	Purves: The Testimony of Justin Martyr	02	Sep
27	Bardenhennach: Patrology	02	Sep
27	Harnack: Patrium Apostolicorum Opera 1,2,3	02	Sep

New College Archives Call Number AA 2.1.96

Page 293

27	Dobselrutz: Xian Life in the primitive Ch	02	Sep
26	Clarke: 1st Clement	02	Sep
26	Moffatt: Grace in the NT	02	Sep
26	Jannen: The Doctrine of Grace	02	Sep
26	Lightfoot: The apostolic Fathers, pt.I,v.1,2	02	Sep
26	Lightfoot: The ap. Fathers, pt.II, v.1,2,3	02	Sep
26	Harnack: Dogmageschichte, I & II	02	Sep
26	Harnack: Die Entstehung d. Christl. Theo.	02	Sep
26	Harnack: Uber. d. Grielhistden Apologium	02	Sep
26	Gebhart u. Harnack: Die altercatio Simonis	02	Sep
26	Muller: Hialrenfeschielte, vo. I	02	Sep
26	Baur: Dogmengeschichte, vol. I	02	Sep
26	Dibeluis: Die apostolisehen Vater . . .	02	Sep
26	Teilgerifeld: Herrnae Pastor	02	Sep
26	Berke: Die Stellunf d. ersten Clemensbriefe	02	Sep
26	Hilgemfeld: Clementis Romani Epistilae	02	Sep
26	Seeberg: G. Bk. of the Hist. of Doct. I & II	02	Sep
26	Haherison: Polycarp's 2 Epistles to the Phil	02	Sep
26	Welty: Claris	02	Sep
26	Goodspeed: Index of Patristics	02	Sep
26	Hitchcock: The Teaching of the 12 Apostles	02	Sep
26	Schaff: The oldest Church manual	02	Sep
26	Loofs: Sietfaden der Dogmengeschichte	02	Sep
26	Seeberg: Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte	02	Sep
26	Shedd: A History of the Church, v. I	02	Sep
26	Barnes: Christianity at Rome	02	Sep
26	Henderson: The Scots Confession	02	Sep
26	Harnack: Hist. of Dogma, Vols. 1 & 2	02	Sep
26	Schlier: Religionsgeschichte Unter . . .	02	Sep

1939

June	21	Seeberg: Dogmengeschichte	02	Oct
	21	Robinson: The Apology of Aristides	02	Sep
	21	Hallich: Die apologie d. Aristides	26	Sep

21	Loofs: Dogmengeschichte	02	Oct
21	Goodspeed: Die älteste Apologeten	18	Jul

Later entries could also be added to this list, but they are extensive, completely covering up to 01 September 1950, as well as from 14 January 1963 until 20

December 1965. Their call numbers and page numbers are as follows:

New College Archives Call Number AA 2.1.96	page 385
New College Archives Call Number AA 2.1.96	page 389
New College Archives Call Number AA 2.1.96	page 423
New College Archives Call Number AA 2.1.96	page 456
New College Archives Call Number AA 2.1.96	page 577
New College Archives Call Number AA 2.1.97	page 14
New College Archives Call Number AA 2.1.97	page 65
New College Archives Call Number AA 2.1.96	page 450
New College Archives small red register with no page numbers	

Time did not permit the transcription of the information they contained.

APPENDIX 3

TORRANCE'S AUBURN SEMINARY LECTURES

Thomas Forsyth Torrance cut short his post-graduate studies in Basel under Karl Barth after only the winter and summer terms of the 1937-38 academic year at the insistence of New College's John Baillie. Baillie persuaded Torrance to travel to America to lecture in theology at Auburn Theological Seminary in Auburn, New York (USA), for the 1938-39 academic year.¹

On 11 February 1993, after laying out my findings in the New College Archives concerning the first occasion on which he ever met and heard Karl Barth lecture, Professor Torrance kindly took me to his home office and pulled two worn leather suitcases from the attic. Inside these suitcases were well-organized bundles of his manuscript Auburn Seminary Lectures, as well as some later miscellaneous materials. He offered them to me for my dissertation research. For a full listing of materials in these suitcases, see Appendix 4.

Torrance's main 1938/39 dogmatics lectures at Auburn were in several sections:

The Doctrine of Revelation (59 pages)
The Doctrine of God with 12 short lectures (294 pages)
The Doctrine of Jesus Christ (351 pages)

¹Torrance, Karl Barth, Biblical and Evangelical Theologian, 124.

The lectures entitled "The Doctrine of God," which totaled 139 pages, were bundled with 12 related shorter lectures, which totaled 155 pages. Thus, altogether, the full bundle on the doctrine of God totaled 294 pages. It appears that Torrance covered on average 10 pages per lecture hour at Auburn Theological Seminary and that the doctrine of revelation and the doctrine of God were covered in the fall semester, while the doctrine of Christ was covered in the spring semester.²

The doctrine of revelation lectures are the least developed of the lot. They have only limited text notes and few quotations.³

The doctrine of God lectures are wide ranging. Along with the twelve short lectures on related subjects tied in the bundle, these lectures are complete with text notes and quotations.

However, for our own study, Torrance's Auburn christology lectures are most important. In his 1939 christology lectures at Auburn Theological Seminary, Torrance expounded "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ" under the following chapter titles:

1. Introduction (page 1)
2. The Encounter with Christ (page 22)
3. The Gospel Testimony to Christ (page 37)
4. The Apostolic Testimony to Christ (page 76)
5. The Significance of Christ for Faith (page 102)
6. The Incarnation (page 123)
7. The Pre-existence of Christ (page 173)
8. The Humiliation of Christ (page 181)
9. The Significance of the Humanity of Christ (page 217)
10. The Significance of the Divinity of Christ (page 229)
11. The Person and Work of Christ (page 243)

²These are estimates based on the manuscripts themselves. Repeated attempts to obtain further information through the remains of old Auburn Seminary, now in New York City, were fruitless.

³Torrance's debt to F. W. Camfield and Karl Barth is most obvious in these lectures.

12. The Background of the Cross (page 254)
13. The Mediation of Christ (page 268)
14. The Atonement on the Cross (page 287)
15. Forgiveness and Reconciliation (page 316)
16. The Resurrection of Christ (page 332)
17. The Ascension and the Second Advent (page 337)

These Auburn christology lectures were prepared in typed manuscript form, including a title page, table of contents, preface, and chapters, but never published. The table of contents appears to have been drawn up after the completion of chapter 13, because starting page numbers are given for chapters 1 through 14, but not the final 3 chapters. Unfortunately, chapter 14 (pages 287-315) has apparently been lost: it was not in the attic leather suitcase holding these and Torrance's other Auburn lectures in his home. Repeated attempts to locate this missing chapter were unsuccessful. Although this loss of some 8% of the total manuscript is regrettable, the 92% of the material remaining is quite interesting in its own right. Also, it was Torrance's habit to recapitulate the previous chapter at the beginning of the next, so not all of its content has been lost.

Numbering some 351 pages, these lectures are a significant source of insight into the sources and development of Torrance's early thought. The manuscript text is replete with gracious text notes, indicating the major sources and texts behind the formulation of these early lectures.

What sources does the young Torrance draw upon in these early christology lectures? While a simple accounting of references or names mentioned in these lectures is no substitute for a careful weighing of the theological influence behind them, it is instructive to begin noting even the broad contours of these manuscripts. Of course, Torrance's lectures might have been crafted to hide a wealth of learning from a

rather hostile audience.⁴

But sight must not be lost of the fact that these were the first lectures Torrance ever wrote and he was pressed for time when doing so, leaving little time for subtlety. The sources Torrance considered important enough to draw upon in his lectures are noteworthy in themselves, since Torrance later notes how important this exercise was for the development of his own thought.⁵

What sources are visible in these lectures as influences on Torrance's early thinking? Early church material is scant. Irenaeus is mentioned only once. Athanasius's De Incarnatione is directly cited on two pages and indirectly on two others. Augustine is mentioned five times in passing, although apparently at second hand from Barth. These lectures do not yet reflect sustained interaction with early church materials, which would so come to characterize Torrance's later development.

Reformation materials are also limited. Calvin is mentioned only twice, and then apparently at second hand. Luther is mentioned eight times: five times at second hand from Barth or Mackintosh, and three times from a memorable phrase or in passing. Melancthon is mentioned four times in passing. Again, sustained interaction

⁴Torrance is on record that he greatly enjoyed his time at Auburn. See Hesslink, 53-54; and Torrance, Karl Barth, Biblical and Evangelical Theologian, 124-125. However, Torrance has also said that the students he taught were rather more liberal than he and hostile at times (T. F. Torrance, interview by author, 29 January 1990, Edinburgh, tape recording). During this period in his life, it was not unknown for Torrance to conceal his real sources from antagonistic audiences. Compare John McPake's insightful analysis of the earliest published address by Torrance and the hostile context in which Torrance was speaking. See Torrance, The Modern Theological Debate; McPake, 288; and Geraint Fielder, Lord of the Years (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988), 124-125.

⁵Torrance, Karl Barth, Biblical and Evangelical Theologian, 124-125; and Hesslink, 53-54.

with the Reformers is not visible in these lectures, although at one interesting point Luther's contribution to Torrance's christology is apparent.

The milieu in which Torrance appears to be writing these lectures is decidedly modern. The most frequently cited works are:

- Emil Brunner's The Mediator with 33 citations
- Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics I/1 with 22 citations
- P. T. Forsyth's Person and Place of Christ with 16 citations
- H. R. Mackintosh's Doctrine of the Person of Christ with 15 citations
- Karl Adam's The Son of God with 10 citations
- Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics I/2 with 10 citations
- F. W. Camfield's Revelation and the Holy Spirit with 8 citations

The degree to which Torrance is relying upon these sources can hardly be overstated. Sections of each lecture are drawn rather substantially and directly from one or more such works. The points where Torrance digresses into a more free ranging treatment are the creative exceptions to the more mundane rule.

The most frequently cited authors are also instructive:

- Karl Barth with 39 total citations
 - Church Dogmatics I/1 with 22 citations
 - Church Dogmatics I/2 with 10 citations
 - Credo with 4 citations
 - The Word of God and the Word of Man with 2 citations
 - The Gifford Lectures with 1 citation
- Emil Brunner with 37 total citations
 - The Mediator with 33 citations
 - Our Faith with 2 citations
 - Word and World with 1 citation
 - Theology of Crisis and Crisis of Theology with 1 citation
- H. R. Mackintosh 20 total citations
 - Doctrine of the Person of Christ with 15 citations
 - The Christian Experience of Forgiveness with 4 citations
 - The Christian Application of Grace with 1 citation
- P. T. Forsyth with 17 total citations
 - The Person and Place of Christ with 16 citations
 - The Work of Christ with 1 citation
- Karl Adam with 10 total citations
 - The Son of God with 10 citations

F. W. Camfield with 8 total citations

Revelation and the Holy Spirit with 8 citations

In addition, Ritschl or his school of thought are mentioned or cited thirteen times, but more often than not as a polemic foil rather than as a constructive part of Torrance's positive theology.

In contrast, less frequent yet important theological contributions to Torrance's free-ranging thought are also apparent from the work of Edward Irving, John McLeod Campbell, R. W. Dale, H. A. A. Kennedy, James Denney, and William Manson.

APPENDIX 4

TORRANCE EARLY MANUSCRIPT COLLECTION

The following is a random list of manuscript materials stored in two leather suitcases in T. F. Torrance's attic and catalogued on 11 February 1993 for possible future inclusion in the New College Archives. Items have been described and dated, if possible.

Item #1

Title: "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ"
Date: 1939
Occasion: Auburn Theological Seminary Lectures
Length: 351 numbered and typed pages (of these, pages 287-315 are missing)
plus Preface and Contents (only 1 page each)
Outline:
Preface
Contents
Chapter 1, Introduction
Chapter 2, The Encounter with Christ
Chapter 3, The Gospel Testimony to Christ
Chapter 4, The Apostolic Testimony to Christ
Chapter 5, The Significance of Christ for Faith
Chapter 6, The Incarnation
Chapter 7, The Pre-existence of Christ
Chapter 8, The Humiliation of Christ
Chapter 9, The Significance of the Humanity of Christ
Chapter 10, The Significance of the Divinity of Christ
Chapter 11, The Person and Work of Christ
Chapter 12, The Background of the Cross
Chapter 13, The Mediation of Christ
Chapter 15, The Forgiveness of the Son of Man
Chapter 16, The Resurrection of Christ
Chapter 17, The Ascension and Second Advent of Christ
Other: in separate red folder
each chapter stapled separately

Chapter 14, The Atonement on the Cross (pages 287-315) is
unfortunately missing

Item #2

Title: "The Knowledge of God"
Date: 1938/39
Occasion: Auburn Theological Seminary Lectures
Length: 16 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: in bundle with other lectures on doctrine of God
stapled

Item #3

Title: "The Old Testament Doctrine of God"
Date: 1938/39
Occasion: Auburn Theological Seminary Lectures
Length: 27 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: in bundle with other lectures on doctrine of God
in 2 stapled parts

Item #4

Title: "The New Testament Doctrine of God"
Date: 1938/39
Occasion: Auburn Theological Seminary Lectures
Length: 2 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: in bundle with other lectures on doctrine of God
unstapled
outline of item #5

Item #5

Title: "The Doctrine of God in the New Testament"
Date: 1938/39

Occasion: Auburn Theological Seminary Lectures
Length: 20 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: in bundle with other lectures on doctrine of God
stapled

Item #6

Title: "The Doctrine of God in St. Paul"
Date: 1938/39
Occasion: Auburn Theological Seminary Lectures
Length: 19 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: in bundle with other lectures on doctrine of God
stapled

Item #7

Title: "The Doctrine of God in Traditional Theology"
Date: 1938/39
Occasion: Auburn Theological Seminary Lectures
Length: 11 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: in bundle with other lectures on doctrine of God
stapled

Item #8

Title: "The Christian Doctrine of God"
Date: 1938/39
Occasion: Auburn Theological Seminary Lectures
Length: 139 numbered pages
Outline: Constructive Account (pages 1-89)
The Trinity (pages 90-111)
The Holy Spirit (pages 112-139)
Other: in bundle with other lectures on doctrine of God
multiple stapled parts
items #9 and #11 may well go with this item

Item #9

Title: "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit: The Sacraments"
Date: 1938/39
Occasion: Auburn Theological Seminary Lectures
Length: 8 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: in bundle with other lectures on doctrine of God
stapled
may well go with item #8

Item #10

Title: "Intercessory Prayer: Its Reasonableness and the Nature of Its Efficacy"
Date: 1938/39
Occasion: Auburn Theological Seminary Lectures
Length: 27 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: in bundle with other lectures on doctrine of God
stapled

Item #11

Title: "Christ's View of God, and Ours"
Date: 1938/39
Occasion: Auburn Theological Seminary Lectures
Length: 5 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: in bundle with other lectures on doctrine of God
stapled
may well go with item #8

Item #12

Title: "The Old Testament Point of View"
Date: 1938/39
Occasion: Auburn Theological Seminary Lectures
Length: 13 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: in bundle with other lectures on doctrine of God

stapled

Item #13

Title: "I am crucified with Christ...Gal. 2:20"
Date: 1938/39?
Occasion: Auburn Theological Seminary sermon?
Length: 7 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: in bundle with other lectures on doctrine of God
stapled

Item #14

Title: "The Call for a New Discussion on the Doctrine of Grace"
Date: ?
Occasion: ?
Length: 35 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: stapled and unstapled pages

Item #15

Title: "The Christian Doctrine of Revelation"
Date: 1938/39
Occasion: Auburn Theological Seminary Lectures
Length: 59 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: stapled and unstapled pages

Item #16

Title: "Christian Education: Towards a New Emphasis"
Date: ?
Occasion: ?
Length: 9 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: stapled

Item #17

Title: "What is Christian Education?"
Date: ?
Occasion: ?
Length: 11 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: stapled

Item #18

Title: "The Character of Theological Thought"
Date: ?
Occasion: ?
Length: 28 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: stapled
perhaps the earlier edition from which the IVF Prayer Lectures were
taken

Item #19

Title: "Philosophy and Theology"
Date: ?
Occasion: ?
Length: 45 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: stapled

Item #20

Title: "Psychology and Theology"
Date: ?
Occasion: ?
Length: 46 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: stapled

Item #21

Title: "Science and Theology"
Date: ?
Occasion: ?
Length: 61 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: stapled
on page 48 the title reverses to "Theology and Science"

Item #22

Title: "Revelation: Prof. Kraemer of Leiden, 'The Christian Message in a non-Christian World,' Edin. House Press"
Date: ?
Occasion: ?
Length: 3 unnumbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: stapled
pages 2 and 3 reversed

Item #23

Title: "Theology and Action"
Date: 1941?
Occasion: New College Theological Society Honorary Presidential Address or IVF Prayer Lectures?
Length: 45 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: unstapled

Item #24

Title: "Christian Faith"
Date: ?
Occasion: ?
Length: 42 numbered pages plus endnotes and extra inserts
Outline: N/A

Other: unstapled

Item #25

Title: "The Death of Christ in St. Paul"
Date: ?
Occasion: ?
Length: 23 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: unstapled

Item #26

Title: "Faith and Philosophy"
Date: ?
Occasion: ?
Length: 25 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: unstapled
published as: "Faith and Philosophy," Hibbert Journal 47 (1948/49):
237-46.

Item #27

Title: "Towards a Christian Philosophy by Leonard Hodgson, D.D. (Nesbet
and Co., 1942)"
Date: ?
Occasion: ?
Length: 9 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: stapled
published in much shorter form as: Review of Leonard Hodgson,
Towards a Christian Philosophy in Evangelical Quarterly 15
(1943):237-39.

Item #28

Title: "Theology and the Church"

Date: pre-1950
Occasion: ?
Length: 15 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: bound in orange cover with other items
rough draft of IVF Prayer Lectures?

Item #29

Title: "Scholasticism and Theology"
Date: pre-1950
Occasion: ?
Length: 6 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: bound in orange cover with other items
rough draft of IVF Prayer Lectures?

Item #30

Title: "The Background of the Modern Theological Debate: Notes taken from
a lecture by Rev. T. F. Torrance, M.A., B.D."
Date: 1940
Occasion: IVF Prayer Lectures
Length: 11 unnumbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: bound in orange cover with other items

Item #31

Title: "The Character of Theological Thought: Notes taken from a lecture by
Rev. T. F. Torrance, M.A., B.D."
Date: 1940
Occasion: IVF Prayer Lectures
Length: 16 unnumbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: bound in orange cover with other items

Item #32

Title: "The Relation Between Philosophy and Theology: Notes taken from a lecture by Rev. T. F. Torrance, M.A., B.D."
Date: 1940
Occasion: IVF Prayer Lectures
Length: 20 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: bound in orange cover with other items

Item #33

Title: "Barthianism and Christian Thinking by H. A. Hodges"
Date: 1942
Occasion: TFT from The Christian News-Letter editor of 15 Jan 1942
Length: 7 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: in file folder
strong critique of paper by TFT
Moot paper

Item #34

Title: "The Place and Function of Reason in Christian Theology"
Date: 1942 or earlier
Occasion: ?
Length: 17 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: in file folder
later published as "The Place nad Function of Reason in Christian Theology," Evangelical Quarterly 14 (1942): 22-41.

Item #35

Title: "Christianity and Philosophy"
Date: ?
Occasion: ?
Length: 8 numbered small pages
Outline: N/A
Other: in file folder

Item #36

Title: "Personal Logic"
Date: ?
Occasion: ?
Length: 12 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: in file folder
book review of Hodgson's Towards a Christian Philosophy
see item #27 above

Item #37

Title: no title
Date: ?
Occasion: ?
Length: 3 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: in file folder
speech on lessons learned in the war

Item #38

Title: no title
Date: ?
Occasion: ?
Length: 12 unnumbered typed pages and 1 page of hand notes
Outline: N/A
Other: in file folder
on philosophy and theology
missing front page or pages

Item #39

Title: no title
Date: ?
Occasion: ?
Length: 13 hand notes on scraps of paper
Outline: N/A
Other: in file folder

on art, theology, and perhaps sermons
no obvious unifying theme or form

Item #40

Title: "Theology and Art"
Date: 1939?
Occasion: Auburn Theological Seminary Lectures?
Length: 9 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: in file folder

Item #41

Title: "The Incarnation and the Old Israel"
Date: ?
Occasion: New College Lectures?
Length: 23 numbered pages of notes with extra pages inserted
Outline: N/A
Other: not stapled
includes follow on lecture on "The Incarnation and the New Israel"
in language and substance sounds like New College lectures #106-114
deals extensively with anhypostasia and enhypostasia

Item #42

Title: "The Virgin Birth"
Date: ?
Occasion: New College Lectures?
Length: 40 numbered pages of notes with extra pages inserted
Outline: N/A
Other: not stapled

Item #43

Title: "Theology and the Church"
Date: 1949?
Occasion: ?

Length: 35 numbered pages
Outline: N/A
Other: in grey cover
prepared during Aberdeen pastorate

Item #44

Title: T. F. Torrance's notes from H. R. Mackintosh's lectures
Date: 1936?
Occasion: H. R. Mackintosh's New College Lectures
Length: 12 randomn sets of stapled unnumbered pages
Outline: The Apostolic View of Christ
The Gospel and History
Speculative Questions: Incarnation and Pre-existence
Providence
Is God Knowable?
Biblical Conceptions of God
The Christology of the Ancient Church
Dogmatics
Dogmatics: Revelation
The Doctrine of Man
Eternal Life
Idea of God in Traditional Theology
Other: handwritten class notes
typed version in item #47?

Item #45

Title: Torrance's notes from H. R. Mackintosh's lectures
Date: 1936?
Occasion: H. R. Mackintosh's New College lectures
Length: 1 student notebook with loose pages inserted
Outline: N/A
Other: handwritten class notes

Item #46

Title: H. R. Mackintosh's lecture handouts
Date: 1936?
Occasion: H. R. Mackintosh's New College lectures

Length: 2 sets of handouts
Outline: Doctrine of Man
 Doctrine of Man and Sin
Other: prepared by Mackintosh for his class lectures

Item #47

Title: "Professor Mackintosh's Papers"
Date: 1936?
Occasion: H. R. Mackintosh's New College lectures
Length: 93 partially numbered typed pages (including outline)
Outline: see first two pages of 93 total, plus one lecture ("28. Biblical and
 Historical Conceptions of the Spirit and The Spirit in Faith and
 Experience"), minus all four lectures on Athanasius, summary of
 Cunningham lectures, and examination paper in practical
 theology
Other: prepared by Mackintosh for his class lectures?

Item #48

Title: Letter from H. R. Mackintosh to W. Herrmann
Date: 3 October 1906
Occasion: N/A
Length: 2 typed pages
Outline: N/A
Other: from Marburg University Library

APPENDIX 5

TORRANCE'S NEW COLLEGE LECTURES

A copy of Torrance's manuscript, New College Dogmatic Lectures, was graciously provided to this author on 22 November 1989 in Torrance's attic home office. Written permission was later given by Professor Torrance for their use in this study--see Appendix 6.

These New College lectures amount to 474 pages of double-spaced type. The list of lectures provided is as follows:

Lecture Title	Number of Pages
TFT: Xeroxed Lectures	2
Outline of Lectures	6
Revelation and Religion	2
Scientific Dogmatics	4
Theses on Truth	3
Where is God?	7
The Old Israel and the Incarnation (excerpt from Conflict and Agreement, pp. 287-303)	9
Outline of the Doctrine of Christ	5
Jesus Christ the Servant-Son	9
The Once for All Union of God and Man in Christ	18
The Continuous Union in the Historical Life and Obedience of Jesus	13
The Life and Faithfulness of the Son Towards Man	16
The Mystery of Christ	15
The Hypostatic Union	8
The Patristic Doctrine of Christ	9
The Reformed Doctrine of Christ	10

The Kingdom of Christ and Evil	16
The Idea of Substitution in the Doctrine of the Atonement (by F. W. Camfield, <u>Scottish Journal of Theology</u> 1, 1948)	1
The Understanding of Redemption in the Early Church	18
Historical Emphases in the Doctrine of Atonement	3
The Idea of Substitution in the Doctrine of the Atonement (by F. W. Camfield)	6
Atoning Justification	19
The Priesthood of Christ	19
The Priestly Aspect of Atonement	3
Reconciliation	17
Range of Redemption	13
Eschatology	24
The One Church of God	23
The Doctrine of the Church	20
Reconciliation in Christ and in His Church	6
The One Baptism Common to Christ and His Church	21
The Place of Water in the Theology and Practice of Baptism in the Church of Scotland	4
A Neglected Aspect of the Doctrine of Baptism	45
The Paschal Mystery of Christ and the Eucharist	18
The Paschal Mystery of Christ and the Eucharist: General Theses	4
The Christian Doctrine of Marriage	8
Service in Jesus Christ	12
Lawful Ministry and Ordination in the Church of Scotland	12
Elders	4
Ecumenism	7
Toward an Ecumenical Consensus on the Trinity	14
The <u>Quicunque vult</u> or 'Athanasian Creed'	1
<hr/>	
Total Pages	474

These New College Dogmatic Lecture manuscripts are not entirely unknown to other students of Torrance's theology. In the opening introduction to his Nottingham dissertation, Stamps included one reference to a New College lecture by Torrance, but it was a passing comment from an oral lecture, not a carefully studied manuscript.¹ In

¹Stamps, 2 and 61.

his 1983 Aberdeen dissertation, Kang acknowledges Torrance's kindly making available to him "his many unpublished manuscripts."² However, it is unclear whether Kang had in mind the bulk of Torrance's New College lectures, since he mentions only one such lecture in his bibliography and does not even cite it in his text.³ Kruger had half a dozen of Torrance's New College lectures and Trook had nearly a dozen, but they appear to have used them sparingly, perhaps because of their topics.⁴

Only Guthridge used Torrance's New College lectures extensively. In fact, his whole 1967 dissertation written at the Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana in Rome is a comparative study of Torrance's published writings and unpublished New College lectures on christology and soteriology.⁵ Confusion, however, exists over Guthridge's work, since his full dissertation is virtually inaccessible via inter-library loan: the Gregorian does not readily respond to repeated requests for materials by graduates

²Kang, iv.

³Kang, 477. This one New College lecture is titled "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ," which is also in our list. Perhaps the other manuscripts Kang had in mind were the draft of Torrance's 1982 Didsbury Lectures, later to be published as The Mediation of Christ in 1983.

⁴Kruger knows six lectures: "The Doctrine of the Church" (Kruger, 339); "The Doctrine of Redemption in the Early Church" (Kruger, 340); "The Hypostatic Union" (Kruger, 342); "The Life and Faithfulness of the Son Towards Man" (Kruger, 343); "The Range of Redemption" (Kruger, 346); and "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ" (Kruger, 346). Trook knows eleven: "The Old Israel and the Incarnation" (Trook, 413); "The Continuous Union in the Historical Life and Obedience of Jesus" (Trook, 413); "Jesus Christ the Servant-Son" (Trook, 413); "The Life and Faithfulness of the Son Toward Man" (Trook, 413); "The Understanding of Redemption in the Early Church" (Trook, 413); "Historical Emphases in the Doctrine of Atonement" (Trook, 413); "Atoning Justification" (Trook, 414); "Reconciliation" (Trook, 414); "The Priesthood of Christ" (Trook, 414); "Priestly Aspect of Atonement" (Trook, 414); and "The Paschal Mystery of Christ and the Eucharist" (Trook, 414).

⁵Guthridge, 8.

who have left orders!⁶ A short, edited excerpt from chapter 4 of his dissertation, which was published in Australia under his Latinized name, Joannes Guthridge, is known to some other studies, but has apparently deflected interest in the fuller study.⁷

Dating these New College Lectures is not an easy task. Interestingly, Kang and Kruger do not date their lectures.⁸ Trook gives a date of pre-1974, without any explanation.⁹ Oddly, Guthridge's careful study does not address the issue of the date of the lectures; he merely notes that he was allowed to examine them by Torrance in the summer of 1966, when he visited Edinburgh to gather research materials.¹⁰

Guthridge's fuller work employed the exact same lecture manuscripts Professor Torrance supplied for this study, as can be clearly seen by simple comparison of all the textual extracts cited in our two studies.¹¹ Curiously, Torrance is on record that he re-wrote his lectures frequently.¹² Perhaps his comment has reference to continuing labors on the lectures during the mid-1950's to the mid 1960's. Based on internal evidence, the latest work referenced is the English translation of Barth's Church

⁶The present author was only able to secure a copy of Guthridge's full work through Professor Torrance and the local Roman Catholic Bishop with whom he was on close terms.

⁷Joannes Guthridge, The Christology of T. F. Torrance: Revelation and Reconciliation in Christ (Melbourne: Society of St. Paul, 1967).

⁸Kang, 477; Kruger, 339, 340, 342, 343, 346.

⁹Trook, 413-414.

¹⁰Guthridge, 8.

¹¹Every quote by Guthridge of Torrance's New College lectures was checked against the manuscripts with which I was provided. Never once did they deviate.

¹²Hesselink, 61.

Dogmatics IV/1, which was published in 1956.¹³ Thus, we may safely conclude that Torrance's New College lectures date between 1956 and 1965.

These New College lectures bear indirect witness to the relevance of Torrance's 1939 Auburn christology lectures to the development of his thought. On several occasions, excerpts from the earlier Auburn lectures appear nearly intact in Torrance's New College lectures.¹⁴

The contrast between Torrance's unpublished lecture manuscripts and published writings cannot be overstated. In the main, Torrance's unpublished lectures are, as Guthridge put it so well,

a straight-forward exposition of Christology and Soteriology as such, whereas the published writings contain a kind of "applied Christology"--the doctrine of the Person and Work of Christ "thought through" or "applied" to the Christian understanding of the Church, and to the Sacraments, Ministry and Message.¹⁵

Thus, the two sets of material complement each other, and each is required for a full appreciation of Torrance's theological program.¹⁶ The importance of the unpublished

¹³Torrance, "The Reformed Doctrine of Christ," 4.

¹⁴For example, on page 9 of his New College Lecture "The Kingdom of Christ and Evil," Torrance appears to be quoting from page 259 of his Auburn Seminary lectures on christology. Also, and more germane to our topic of carnal union with Christ, the strong influence of Luther's hymn "A Safe Stronghold our God is Still" on Torrance's christology is evident both on page 280 of his Auburn Seminary lectures on christology, as well as page 14 of his New College lecture, "Atoning Justification." While it is beyond the scope of this study to probe the degree of dependence, the wording of each section raises the issue of continuity between these two sets of lectures.

¹⁵Guthridge, 8-9.

¹⁶This may well account for the limitations of one previous study of Torrance's eucharistic theology. Lacking knowledge of Torrance's more systematic treatment from either his unpublished New College lectures or Guthridge's full treatment of them,

lectures lies in their ability to make Torrance's dogmatic intent more plain, whereas merely looking at his published writings is apt to leave the casual observer somewhat at sea.¹⁷

Guthridge notes that in 1966 Torrance requested that these lectures be considered "subject to correction" and thus, "to a certain extent, unfinalized."¹⁸ This same caveat is absent from Kang's 1983 dissertation. Now, after more than 30 years, this early caveat seems somewhat less germane.

Our current examination of Torrance's New College lectures is the most thorough since Guthridge's more lengthy yet obscure work and the only study to focus on his doctrine of union with Christ.

Stamps does not penetrate as much as one might like into the inner logic of Torrance's doctrine.

¹⁷Does the difference between the lecture and published materials account for some of the charges that Torrance is obtuse in style or content? See Gerrit Smith, Review of God and Rationality by T. F. Torrance, Theological Studies 32 (1971): 514; Ronald Lunt, Review of Theology in Reconciliation by T. F. Torrance, Expository Times 87 (1976): 379. Professor Bromiley, co-editor with Torrance of Barth's Church Dogmatics, is said to have commented once that reading Barth in German is easier than reading Torrance in English! See Kang, 431. For Torrance's self-reflection on this point, see Michael Boumann, Roundtable: Conversations with European Theologians (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1990), 117-118.

¹⁸Guthridge, 13.

APPENDIX 6

COPY OF T. F. TORRANCE'S LETTER OF PERMISSION
FOR USE OF HIS UNPUBLISHED LECTURES

The Very Rev Professor Thomas F Torrance
37 Braid Farm Road
Edinburgh EH10 6LE
Tel (031) 447-3058x 3224

April 30, 1993

This is a letter to certify that I have given Mr Duncan Rankin permission to make use of my unpublished lectures in writing his dissertation on "Carnal Union with Christ in the Theology of T.F. Torrance".

Thomas F. Torrance

APPENDIX 7

MATERIALS ON T. F. TORRANCE IN THE KARL BARTH-ARCHIV

The Karl Barth-Archiv, housed in Barth's last home at Bruderholzallee 26 in Basel, Switzerland and directed by Pfarrer Dr. Hinrich Stoevesandt, houses a wealth of information not only on Barth but also on his student and colleagues. On 11 July 1991, I visited the archive in the hopes of finding copies of correspondence between Barth and Torrance, as well as materials by Torrance perhaps read (and marked!) by Barth. The trip was not in vain.

While the restrictions on either examination or citation of materials in the Karl Barth-Archiv are rather strict, permission was kindly granted in writing by both Professor Torrance and Pfarrer Dr. Stoevesandt (through his assistant Ruth Ziemer) for the use of these materials for this study.¹

Letters by T. F. Torrance to Karl Barth in the Karl Barth-Archiv are as follows:

23 January 1941 [sic 1940], 5 pages
30 October 1940, 7 pages
25 March 1941, 2 pages
22 January 1947, 2 pages
16 April 1947, 3 pages
27 May 1948, 2 pages
30 March 1949, 2 pages
07 April 1949, 2 pages
23 September 1949, 1 page
07 December 1949, 3 pages

¹See Appendix 8 and Appendix 9.

30 December 1949, 1 page
31 January 1950, 2 pages
08 March 1950, 1 page
22 March 1950, 1 page
29 October 1950, 2 pages
14 March 1953, 2 pages
01 August 1955, 2 pages
09 August 1955, 1 page
02 October 1955, 2 pages
27 March 1956, 1 page
07 May 1956, 1 page
05 June 1956, 1 page
29 June 1956, 2 pages
29 October 1956, 1 page
03 April 1960, 1 page
19 April 1960, 3 pages
15 May 1960, 1 page
17 September 1960, 1 page
07 January 1961, 3 pages
14 April 1962, 1 page
07 May 1966, 1 page
19 June 1967, 2 pages
18 September 1968, 1 page

Letters by Karl Barth to T. F. Torrance in the Karl Barth-

Archiv are as follows:

21 February 1940, 1 page
11 April 1947, 1 page
11 April 1947, 1 page [letter of recommendation]
18 February 1953, 1 page
05 August 1954, 1 page
26 May 1956, 1 page
08 April 1960, 1 page

The Karl Barth-Archiv also contains 6 letters from T. F. Torrance to Karl Barth's assistant, Charlotte von Kirschbaum, as well as 4 letters from Kirschbaum to Torrance.

In addition to correspondence, a number of other interesting documents are contained in the Karl Barth-Archiv. The "Protokollbuch für das Dogmatische Seminar

über Das Problem der natürlichen Theologie, W. S. 1937/38" contains notes taken and signed by T. F. Torrance for the session on 3 February 1938 discussing "De Fide et Ratione."² Thus, Torrance was indeed in the inner circle of students working with Barth.

A set of manuscripts from the World Alliance of Reformed Churches is also in the archives. One undated paper by T. F. Torrance on "The Relevance of the Doctrine of the Spirit for Ecumenical Theology" was marked by Barth.³ Two response papers written by John E. Burkhart of McCormack Theological Seminary and George H. Kehm of Pittsburgh Theological Seminary are also in this set and marked by Barth's hand.⁴ Summary worksheet responses to Torrance's paper are also included in the set and marked by Barth.⁵ Finally, Torrance's reply to the criticisms is included in the set, but is not marked by Barth's hand.⁶

²"Protokollbuch für das Dogmatische Seminar über Das Problem der natürlichen Theologie, W. S. 1937/38," Karl Barth-Archiv, Basel, 44-50.

³T. F. Torrance, "The Relevance of the Doctrine of the Spirit for Ecumenical Theology," World Alliance of Reformed Churches, Department of Theology, Geneva, no date, contained in the Karl Barth-Archiv, Basel.

⁴See John E. Burkhart, "The Holy Spirit and Polemics: A Response to Professor Torrance," World Alliance of Reformed Churches, Department of Theology, Geneva, 11 July 1963, contained in the Karl Barth-Archiv, Basel; and George H. Kehm, "Comment on 'The Relevance of the Doctrine of the Spirit for Ecumenical Theology,' a paper by Prof. Thomas F. Torrance (Edinburgh)," World Alliance of Reformed Churches, Department of Theology, Geneva, 3 July 1963, contained in the Karl Barth-Archiv, Basel.

⁵"The Relevance of the Doctrine of the Spirit for Ecumenical Theology," World Alliance of Reformed Churches, Department of Theology, Geneva, November 1963, contained in the Karl Barth-Archiv, Basel.

⁶T. F. Torrance, "The Relevance of the Doctrine of the Spirit for Ecumenical Theology (Reply of Professor Thomas F. Torrance to his Critics)," World Alliance of Reformed Churches, Department of Theology, January 1964, contained in the Karl

Four of Torrance's books are in the Karl Barth-Archiv: Royal Priesthood (1955), The School of Faith (1959), Conflict and Agreement in the Church, volume 2 (1960), and Karl Barth: An Introduction to His Early Theology, 1910-1931 (1962). All are marked in Barth's hand.

The Scottish Journal of Theology was received by Barth and is held in the Karl Barth-Archiv. Two articles by Torrance were marked by Barth.⁷ Four review articles by Torrance were marked as well.⁸

Finally, the 1956 Interim Report of the Church of Scotland's Special Commission on Baptism, which was chaired by Torrance, is in the Karl Barth-Archiv and marked in Barth's hand.⁹

Barth-Archiv, Basel.

⁷These two articles are T. F. Torrance, "Where Do We Go From Lund?" Scottish Journal of Theology 6 (1953): 53-64; and T. F. Torrance, "The Atonement and the Oneness of the Church," Scottish Journal of Theology 7 (1954): 245-269.

⁸These four review articles were T. F. Torrance, Review of The Apostolic Ministry: Essays on the History and Doctrine of Episcopacy, ed. K. E. Kirk, in Scottish Journal of Theology 1 (1948): 190-201; T. F. Torrance, Review of The Oracles of God: An Introduction to the Preaching of John Calvin by T. H. L. Parker, in Scottish Journal of Theology 1 (1948): 212-214; T. F. Torrance, Review of The Fulness of Christ: The Church's Growth into Catholicity in Scottish Journal of Theology 5 (1952): 90-100; and T. F. Torrance, Review of Calvini Opera Selecta, volume II, ed. Peter Barth and Dora Scheuner, in Scottish Journal of Theology 7 (1954): 320-321.

⁹"Interim Report of the Special Commission on Baptism," May 1956, contained in the Karl Barth-Archiv, Basel, 1-42.

APPENDIX 8

COPY OF T. F. TORRANCE'S LETTER OF PERMISSION
FOR USE OF HIS CORRESPONDENCE WITH KARL BARTH

37 Braid Farm Road
Edinburgh EH10 6LE
Scotland
UK

August 13, 1991

Professor Dr. Hinrich Stoevesandt
Karl Barth Archives
Bruderholzallee 26
CH-4059 Basel
Switzerland

Dear Dr. Stoevesandt,

Enclosed please find an autographed copy of my book for your collection, Karl Barth: Biblical and Evangelical Theologian.

Mr. Duncan Rankin, Ph.D. Candidate of New College in Edinburgh, has my permission to use copies of my correspondence with Professor Karl Barth in the Karl Barth Archives.

Also, please send me copies of all my correspondence with Professor Barth extant in your files via Mr. Rankin.

Thank you so very much!

With warmest regards,

Thomas F. Torrance

T.F. Torrance

APPENDIX 9

COPY OF THE KARL BARTH-ARCHIV LETTER OF PERMISSION FOR USE OF ARCHIVE MATERIALS

Karl Barth-Archiv
Pfarrer Dr. Hinrich Stoevesandt

CH-4059 Basel, den
Bruderholzallee 26
Telephon 061/35 27 79

W. Duncan Rankin
64/7 West Mains Road
Edinburgh EH9 3JE
Scotland
UK

Dear Mr. Rankin,

Being the new assistant you already mentioned in your letter, I allow myself to answer your letter instead and with warmest regards of Dr. Hinrich Stoevesandt.

I hope the copies will help you to get new inspirations. After having calculated the costs we would have to charge you for, we agreed to waive the costs for you, in consideration of the fact that the sum you would have to get charged for, would be not worthwhile to get doubled by the charge you would have to pay in addition to this in order to send it to Switzerland.

Concerning your request in terms of the lost copies of the correspondence between Barth and Torrance, we would ask you to be so kind to make a new set of copies from the ones you got and to hand them over to him.

Of course you will be allowed to cite selections from the Barth-Torrance correspondence since you got it to work with it.

With kind regards,


Ruth Ziemer

APPENDIX 10

ARCHIVE FILE ON THE EDINBURGH CHRISTIAN UNION CASE

In his history of modern British evangelicalism, David Bebbington notes that in the 1950's Karl Barth's theology was controversial in the University Christian Union circles. Nowhere was this more so than in Edinburgh:

The divergence was so sharp as to occasion a schism in the Edinburgh University Christian Union, which came under the influence of the Barthian theology of Professor T. F. Torrance and so was disaffiliated in 1953 by the Inter-Varsity Fellowship.¹

Some 272 pages of an archive file on the Edinburgh Christian Union case held at the Universities and Colleges Christian Fellowship headquarters in Leicester, England, were perused for this study, in the hopes that it might provide information on this early ecumenical effort by T. F. Torrance and others.² Due to the personal nature of the correspondence, no permissions were sought to cite the material and none shall be made. However, read in light of the archive file, the published accounts of this matter are more meaningful for our limited purposes here.

¹D. Bebbington, Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989), 245-255.

²See also Geraint Fielder, Lord of the Years (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988), 125, 144-145.

APPENDIX 11

VERBATIM MINUTES OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The Verbatim Minutes of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland are housed in the Principal Clerk's Office in Church of Scotland Headquarters Building on 121 George Street in Edinburgh. Verbatim Minutes are a transcript of everything officially spoken at the General Assembly. They have been kept since 1956. Torrance attended and spoke at many Assemblies for which Verbatim Minutes have been kept, but the more interesting sets of comments and speeches occurred in the following years: 1956, 1957, 1958, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1967, 1970, 1974, and 1990. All of these were consulted in this study.

APPENDIX 12

PETER MARTYR VERMIGLI ON UNION WITH CHRIST

But unless some other kind of communion were offered us, this would be very general and feeble; for the whole human race do already hold in this wise communion with Christ. They are in fact men, as He was Peter Martyr Vermigli, "Martyr to Calvin, Strasburgh, March 8, 1555," in Gleanings of a Few Scattered Ears, 342.

Somewhat is the conjuncture of one and the same matter which we have in common with Christ from his incarnation. . . . Yet nevertheless it is not proper to Christians, for the Turks and Jews, and as many as be comprehended among the number of men, are in this way joined in Christ. Peter Martyr Vermigli, Letter to Theodore Beza, Common Places of the most famous and renowned Divine Doctor Peter Martyr, divided into foure principall parts, Appendix, 105.

What is the doctrine of union with Christ, according to Italian Reformer Peter Martyr Vermigli?

Martyr's Letters to Calvin and Beza

In his letters to John Calvin and Theodore Beza dated 8 March 1555, Peter Martyr treats union with Christ under three distinct headings: natural, spiritual, and mystical. Midway through his letter to Calvin, Martyr summarizes:

We have then here, thus far, two communions with Christ. One is natural, . . . the other is effected by the Spirit of Christ. . . . But I think that between these there is an intermediate one, which is the fount and origin of all the celestial and spiritual likeness which we obtain, together with Christ.¹

After treating the third kind of communion with Christ, Martyr then consolidates his

¹Martyr to Calvin, 343.

position: "These communions with Christ I acknowledge, but others (to say the truth) I do not understand."² Each of these three degrees will now be treated in more detail under separate headings.

Natural Communion with Christ

The first degree of communion with Christ is an implication of the incarnation.

Quoting Hebrews 2:14, Peter Martyr explains to Calvin:

And, firstly, it seems to me, that He was pleased (as is said in the Epistle to the Hebrews) to communicate with us, in flesh and blood, by the benefit of His Incarnation.³

How does Martyr conceive of this incarnational communion occurring? His line of argument in the letter to Calvin is decidedly biological and genetic, pointing to our parents as the source of this communion. It is "natural, which we derive through our origin from our parents."⁴ Martyr then reiterates this biological theme to Calvin: ". . . in corporal flesh and blood they had from their very birth a natural fellowship with Him."⁵

In his letter to Beza, Martyr duplicates his biological argument:

Somewhat is the conjuncture of one and the same matter which we have in

²Martyr to Calvin, 343-344. To Beza, he recaps: "You see therefore what my judgement is on this matter. I believe that there are three degrees of our communion with Christ" Martyr to Beza, 106.

³Martyr to Calvin, 342.

⁴Martyr to Calvin, 343.

⁵Martyr to Calvin, 343. LC, 768: ". . . quam corpore, carne ac sanguine cum eo jam ab ipsa nativitate naturaliter communicaverint." Martyr repeatedly uses "natural," not "incarnational," to describe this communion.

common with Christ from his incarnation.⁶

He concludes, "Then do we begin after some sort to be like unto him when we be born men" ⁷

We have seen that Martyr qualifies this natural communion with Christ with the terms "somewhat" and "after some sort." His qualifications do not end there, however. In his letter to Calvin, he concludes his treatment of natural communion with a candid appraisal:

But unless some other kind of communion were offered us, this would be very general and feeble; for the whole human race do already hold in this wise communion with Christ. They are in fact men, as He was⁸

Martyr's discounting of incarnational communion as unexceptional is echoed in more specific terms to Beza:

Somewhat is the conjuncture of one and the same matter which we have in common with Christ from his incarnation. . . . Yet nevertheless it is not proper to Christians, for the Turks and Jews, and as many as be comprehended among

⁶Martyr to Beza, 105. LC, 777: "Conjunctio ejusdem naturae, quam cum Christo ab ejus incarnatione communem habemus" Note that Gorham's translation of naturae should perhaps read "nature," rather than "matter." Martyr also here cites Hebrews 2:14. He later designates our human nature as that "which by the benefit of the first creation was all in one nature with that which Christ in his birth took of the Virgin" Martyr to Beza, 105.

⁷Martyr to Beza, 105. Martyr gives no explanation for natural communion that would not also apply to the relationship between any two other human beings.

⁸Martyr to Calvin, 342. Gorham's translation continues this last sentence: "They are in fact men, as He was *man*." The final word "man" is, however, editorial embellishment and potentially misleading. The Latin reads: "Verum, nisi aliud communionis genus intercederet, communis admodum haec esset & debilis. Nam quotquot humana specie comprehenduntur, hac ratione jam cum Christo communicant: sunt quippe homines, ut ipse fuit." LC 768.

the number of men, are in this way joined in Christ.⁹

Thus, in his 8 March 1555 letters to Calvin and Beza, Martyr plainly acknowledges a relationship that Christ has with all men by virtue of his human nature. This he takes as the starting point of his doctrine of union with Christ, although he says it is little more than that. By studying non-Christians in the world around him, Martyr reasons that the effect of this natural, biological correspondence is rather limited. In isolation, it is a completely ordinary phenomenon that is weak in its direct effects--it does not produce extensive Christ-likeness. Rather than "incarnational union," Martyr's preferred terminology in his letters for this fellowship of natures is "natural communion."

Spiritual Communion with Christ

The second degree of communion with Christ, described by Peter Martyr's 8 March 1555 letter to John Calvin, is brought about by the Holy Spirit. This spiritual relation is

effected by the Spirit of Christ, by which we are from our very regeneration renewed into the fashion of His glory.¹⁰

Unlike the natural communion, Martyr envisions this communion as distinctively and properly for elect Christians only, beginning at their conversion.¹¹ The subsequent

⁹Martyr to Beza, 105. LC, 777: "Conjunctio ejusdem naturae, quam cum Christo ab ejus incarnatione communem habemus. . . . Non tamen Christianis est propria, sic enim Judaei, Turcae, et quotquot hominum censu comprehenduntur, cum Christo conjunguntur." NB: Gorham's "in Christ" is better translated "with Christ."

¹⁰Martyr to Calvin, 343.

¹¹Martyr to Calvin, 342: "So besides that communion [i.e., natural communion], there is added this; that, in due season, faith is breathed into the elect, whereby they

progressive work of the Spirit in the believer's life makes him or her more and more Christiformia or "Christ-shaped" and thus fit for eternal life.¹² Touching the believer even in body and nature, this "renovating influence of the Spirit" has a decidedly eschatological horizon.¹³ The process does not, however, truncate the believer's own humanity or confuse him substantially with Christ.¹⁴

Martyr gives his most moving passage on the doctrine of union with Christ when describing to Beza this progressive relation:

Now then we consist no more of our weak and feeble flesh, nor of faulty and corrupt blood, neither of an unsavoury and sickly soul, but we are clothed with the flesh of Christ, we are watered with the blood of Christ, we live and are

may believe in Christ. . . ." Martyr relates the same to Beza: "Wherefore it behoves that there comes another likeness [other than natural communion] whereby the nature of every Christian, as touching soul, body and blood, is joined to Christ. And that is when by the help and endowment of Christ's benefits we are renewed . . ." (Martyr to Beza, 105). Martyr's language here was obviously not intended to apply to Turks, Jews, and other non-Christians.

¹²Martyr to Calvin, 342-343: At conversion, "faith is breathed into the elect, whereby they may believe in Christ; and thus they have not only remission of sins and reconciliation with God (wherein consists the true and solid method of justification), but, further, receive the renovating influence of the Spirit whereby our bodies also, our flesh, and blood, and nature, are made capable of immortality, and become every day more and more conformable to Christ (*Christiformia*), so to speak."

¹³To Beza, Martyr repeats this theme. The believer's human body and soul are "adorned and daily more and more restored and finally made perfect" at the resurrection "by the heavenly gifts, which through believing, we have obtained" (Martyr to Beza, 105). The editor of Beza's correspondence thus terms the second degree of communion with Christ in his introductory notes not as "spiritual" but as "éternelle, par la résurrection." Beza, 153.

¹⁴Martyr to Calvin, 343: "Not that they [the elect] lose the substance of their own nature, and actually pass into the Body and Blood of Christ; but in spiritual gifts and properties they approach as men to Him, as in corporal flesh and blood they had from their very birth a natural fellowship with Him."

moved by the soul of Christ.¹⁵

Thus, the terms "clothed," "watered," and "live and are moved" are for Martyr dynamic processes in the life of believers, implying real growth.

In his letter to Beza, the Italian Reformer closes his discussion of this second degree of communion with Christ with a clear summary:

You have therefore my singular good brother in few words comprehended the beginning and end of our communion or conjuncture with Christ. Then do we begin after some sort to be like unto him when we be born men and finally when by the faith of Christ we are restored unto his merits, gifts, benefits, and properties; which as we at our conversion begin to obtain, so we shall not have it fully perfect before we be advanced to eternal life by the blessed resurrection.¹⁶

By explicitly relating these two degrees of communion with Christ, Martyr indicates that spiritual communion is built upon natural communion, presupposing it both conceptually and chronologically.

Thus, in his 8 March 1555 letters to Calvin and Beza, Peter Martyr depicts not just the beginning of our communion with Christ, but also the end. Though ordinary and feeble, the starting point is a natural communion that all men share by virtue of being human. The ending point, on the other hand, is a spiritual communion by the power of the Holy Spirit, particular to elect Christian believers only. The glorious end Martyr envisions is obtained by the progressive influence of the Spirit in the believer's life, making him daily more like Christ.

These two degrees of communion with Christ do not constitute the whole of

¹⁵Martyr to Beza, 105. This vivid imagery opens Martyr's treatment of the second degree of communion with Christ in his letter to Beza.

¹⁶Martyr to Beza, 105.

Martyr's doctrine of union with Christ. Behind his experience of this second spiritual degree of communion--and in the pages of the Bible--he sees evidence of a third degree of communion with Christ driving the former. To this third degree I now turn.

Mystical Communion with Christ

In his 8 March 1555 letter to John Calvin, Peter Martyr points to a third and final conjunction with Christ--a "mystical communion"--which he denominates "an intermediate one" between the natural and the spiritual relations previously described.¹⁷ This union of secret mystery, like the second degree expounded before it, is peculiar to Christians alone and begins only at their true conversion: grafted into the body of Christ, the glorified Lord becomes the true Head of the elect, and they truly obtain Him.¹⁸

Martyr posits the priority of this secret relation between the glorified Christ and the believer to any spiritual communion that takes place progressively:

This communion with our Head is prior, in nature at least, if not in time, to that

¹⁷Martyr to Calvin, 343: "But I think that . . . there is an intermediate one, which is the fount and origin of all the celestial and spiritual likeness which we obtain, together with Christ . . . , this mystical communion" In his letter to Beza, Martyr echoes: "Therefore between the first conjunction, which I call nature, and the latter, which I may justly say is of likeness or similitude, I put this mean which may be called a conjunction or union or of secret mystery" (Martyr to Beza, 105-106). The Latin reads: "Proinde inter primam conjunctionem quam naturae voco, & postremam quam similitudinis jure appellaverim, hanc mediam pono, quae unionis aut arcani mysterii dici potest" LC, 778.

¹⁸Martyr to Calvin, 343: "It is that whereby, as soon as we believe, we obtain Christ Himself, our true head, and are made His members Wherefore, when we are converted, Christ is made ours and we His, before we are rendered like Him in holiness and inherent righteousness. This is that secret communion whereby we are said to be grafted into Him." Again, this is not something Peter Martyr posits of Turks and Jews.

later communion which is introduced through renovation.¹⁹

Thus, mystical communion ranks before spiritual communion, not vice versa, according to Martyr.²⁰

Continuing with this anatomical theme, Martyr then gives an extended illustration of this relationship between mystical and spiritual communion with Christ.²¹ Just as the heart pumps blood to every organ through veins that unite them, so too does Christ the fount of life send his Spirit to each member united to Him. Mystical communion provides the same connection between Christ and his members that veins provide between the heart and liver.²² The succor of the Spirit then engenders progressive communion, growth, and renovation of lifestyle in the believer.²³

¹⁹Martyr to Calvin, 343.

²⁰Martyr to Calvin, 343: "And from this [mystical] communion which I have now explained that latter one [progressive spiritual communion] is perfected so long as we live on earth. For the members of Christ are ever intent on becoming more like Him." Whether mystical union necessarily occurs in a temporal interval before the first spiritual improvements in the life of the elect, Martyr wisely abstains from resolving. Could Martyr's hesitation over this temporal sequence be prompted by uncertainty over the experience of Old Testament believers, who shared in the benefits of Christ before the incarnation and their mystical union with the historical Christ? Whatever the case, it is clear that a believer does not work his way up to mystical union via spiritual improvements.

²¹Curiously, Gorham omits this portion of Martyr's 8 March 1555 letter to Calvin. It is found, however, in Anthonie Marten's translation. See CP [Appendix], 97.

²²Aware that any illustration can be taken too far, Martyr cautions: "And although that this similitude ought not to be curiously orged as touching all the parties thereof, yet doth it after a sort laie the matter before our eyes, and doth shewe us, that after we be now men as he was, this first communion with Christ, that we are made his members, ensueth." CP [Appendix], 97.

²³As Martyr vividly describes it: "For according as the spirit floweth from him, he fashioneth and ioyneth unto him sometime this member and sometime that, and by the spirit it selfe, maketh the same like unto him in properties and temperature, forsomuch as they naturallie agree now together." CP [Appendix], 97.

His letter to Beza shows clearly that Martyr was compelled to acknowledge the existence of mystical communion by more than just his own personal experience; the Scriptures also lead the Reformer to his conclusions.²⁴ The scriptural passages Martyr acknowledges as implying this third mystical degree of communion with Christ are Ephesians 4:16 and Colossians 2:19, as well as the marriage motif in Ephesians 5:30-32.²⁵ His primary concern is to account for the fullness of the Holy Spirit in the believer flowing "from the Head itself" to all his limbs.²⁶ Paul's thematic intertwining of marriage and the believer's relation to Christ leads Martyr to acknowledge that the elect are after conversion "flesh of His flesh, bone of His bone."²⁷ No extended exegesis, however, is given in this correspondence.

The physical distance between the glorified Christ and the believer on earth puts no stop to this secret communion, according to Martyr.²⁸ Saving faith, the Word

²⁴Martyr to Beza, 105: "Howbeit between the beginning and end of this communion we must grant and believe that there is a mean, which is secret and much less perceived than those two extreme communions rehearsed. Yet nevertheless it is perceived, if with a faithful attention we consider the Holy Scriptures."

²⁵Allusions to these passages are clear in both letters. Martyr points Calvin to the same scriptural metaphors he mentions to Beza. Martyr to Beza, 106: "... the mystical degree is expressed in the Holy Scriptures under the metaphor of members and the head, of the husband and the wife." See also Martyr to Calvin, 343.

²⁶Martyr to Calvin, 343: "It is that whereby, as soon as we believe, we obtain Christ Himself, our true head, and are made His members. Whence from the Head itself (as St. Paul says [Eph. iv. 16]) His Spirit flows, and is derived through the joints and ligaments into us, as his true and legitimate members."

²⁷"This is that secret communion whereby we are said to be grafted into Him. Thus we first put Him on; and so are called by the Apostle flesh of His flesh, bone of His bones" (Martyr to Calvin, 343). This is obviously deduced from a comparison of Ephesians 5:31-32 with Genesis 2:23-24.

²⁸Martyr to Calvin, 343: "Nor does interval of space hinder this mystical communion, but it may be enjoyed while we live on earth, although the very Body of

of God, and the sacraments are all "bonds or fastenings" that have their origin from Christ and supply believers with an efficient flow of the Spirit from the Head.²⁹ These are then not just "notes and symbols of a true communion with Christ" but "ties and joints through which the Spirit of God becomes efficacious" ³⁰

Although Martyr holds the sacraments in this high position, he does not think that they are absolutely indispensable and is wary of sacramental theories that might twist this important mystical bond into a crass mixture of substances between Christ and the believer. Cyril of Alexandria's teaching provokes special concern from him.³¹ He fears this teaching would

Christ be seated and reigning with the Father in Heaven."

²⁹Martyr to Calvin, 343: "It is quite sufficient that we be knit by certain links and ties of a spiritual kind unto Him. And yet these bonds or fastenings hang upon and are derived from the Head Himself; and these are, Faith (in the first place), God's Word, and His Sacrament. Through those means the Spirit flowing from our Head, is diffused through the Church, and quickens and shapes His members in due proportion."

³⁰Martyr to Calvin, 344. Martyr goes on to qualify this statement, making faith in the believer a necessary prerequisite.

³¹"These [three] communions with Christ I acknowledge, but others (to say the truth) I do not understand. I speak thus chiefly in regard of that which some even of the Fathers introduce, especially Cyril; who make the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ in such wise our food, that they assert it to be really intermingled with our substance. I cannot see how they can escape the position when they thus speak; that our identical flesh and blood, which is so nourished, is transmuted into the same personal substance with Christ; thus diffusing His Body into innumerable places" (Martyr to Calvin, 344). Martyr's repudiation of Cyril of Alexandria is also repeated to Beza: "I will not so easily subscribe to Cyril who affirmed such a communion as thereby even the substance of the flesh and blood of Christ, first is joined to the blessing (for so he calls the holy bread) and then that it is also mingled by the meat [*per illum cibum*, i.e., the food, the sacramental elements] with the flesh and blood of the communicants" (Martyr to Beza, 106). Martyr obviously has in mind transubstantiation.

tie grace and the Spirit either to the outward Word or to Sacraments, as though none could possibly be united to his Head,--I mean Christ,--without them. In adults, faith is the only necessary link and joint whereby we are united to Christ, and that indissolubly.³²

Ending his polemic on a conciliatory note, however, the Italian Reformer concludes:

This is which, perchance, the Fathers intended by their own hyperbolical expressions, in the immoderate use of which they have both left us their writings obscured, and moreover, have afforded a large handle to many errors.³³

In his closing sentences to Beza, Martyr recaps his teaching and then also emphasizes that mystic union does not imply a mingling of substance between Christ and the believer.³⁴ Paul's marriage motif in Ephesians 5 itself rules out a mixture of substance: husbands and wives are indeed one without it. Martyr posits a vital exchange, not a material one, between Christ and the believer based on an accomplished association between them almost too marvelous to describe.

Mystical communion with Christ is, then, for Peter Martyr a fact in the life of elect believers only. Its reality is actively enjoyed by them, but it is biblical teaching that ultimately drives Martyr to posit its existence. Because of this secret union, the gift of the Holy Spirit is the believer's in full measure. Thus, mystical communion is prior at least in nature if not in time to spiritual communion effected by the Holy

³²Martyr to Calvin, 344.

³³Martyr to Calvin, 344.

³⁴Martyr to Beza, 106: "And even as the substance of the head is not mingled with the substance of the foot or hand, although it be knit and joined to them by most straight knots. Again as the substance of the body of the husband grows up not to one and the same body with the wife, although by a singular bond it be coupled together with it, so are we by a wonderful and inward society joined with the body and blood of Christ, although that our substance of each part remain unmingled." This is also emphasized in Martyr's letter to Calvin. See Martyr to Calvin, 343.

Ghost. Saving faith, the Word of God, and the sacraments are the hooks that bind the believer to Christ, through which the Spirit becomes efficacious, overcoming the linear distance between Christ and true believers. Any mixture of substance, Martyr says, is definitely not in view.

Martyr on Incarnational Communion

Does the picture of Martyr's conception of union with Christ gathered from his correspondence with Calvin of 8 March 1555 fit with his other theological writings? Can this understanding of Martyr's doctrine of incarnational communion be confirmed in his wider corpus and thought?

Unfortunately, a definitive scientific edition of Martyr's works has yet to be compiled, leaving the scholar with numerous and varied editions of his commentaries, lectures, and treatises.³⁵ The most complex mixture of Vermigliana is found in the posthumously published Loci Communes collections, which runs to thirteen different major Latin editions dating from 1576 until 1656 and one English translation dated 1583.³⁶

Compiled mainly from his commentaries, the Loci Communes editions are a topical arrangement of the theological excurses Martyr wove into the fabric of his passage-by-passage comments on the biblical text.³⁷ Arranged after the pattern of

³⁵A cursory glance at Donnelly, Kingdon, and Anderson's Bibliography of the Works of Peter Martyr Vermigli makes this abundantly clear. See Donnelly, Kingdon, and Anderson, 1-154 for the best listing of these materials and their locations. Anderson laments the lack of a scientific text. See Anderson, Peter Martyr, 1975, 537.

³⁶Donnelly, Kingdon, and Anderson, 98-127.

³⁷Donnelly, Kingdon, and Anderson, x-xi.

Calvin's 1559 Institutes, the first Latin edition was assembled by Robert Masson some fourteen years after Martyr's death. Subsequent editions include various collections of Martyr's letters and a short bibliography by Josiah Simler.³⁸ Thus, while caution must be exercised when using the Loci Communes, it does provide the best one-volume summary of Martyr's overall theology available.³⁹

The Loci Communes

A survey of Martyr's Loci Communes confirms the conclusions we have drawn from his letters to Calvin and Beza on incarnational communion with Christ. The clearest section treating this topic is given under the heading "What is the union of the godlie with Christ," drawn from Martyr's commentary on Romans 8.⁴⁰ Here the Italian Reformer begins considering the most obvious fact of all--Christ is "joined with all men" by virtue of his humanity.⁴¹ Universal in scope, this relation is obviously not

³⁸Donnelly, Kingdon, and Anderson, 98.

³⁹Precedent does exist in serious Martyr studies for relying on the Loci Communes quite heavily. For example, see Donnelly, Calvinism and Scholasticism, 154-159. It could even be argued that the Loci Communes gives the reader Martyr's most mature reflection on a theological topic, rather than his more abbreviated thought in his running commentary on the biblical text. It is safest to allow Martyr himself to draw the connections between passages and topics, rather than for the twentieth-century researcher to attempt an interpolation or extrapolation. Advice for the researcher when using the Loci Communes is given in Anderson, Peter Martyr, 1975, 536-537.

⁴⁰CP [3], 77-79. The marginal note at the first of this section reads: "In Rom. 8, at the beginning." Martyr's In Epistolam S. Pauli Apostoli ad Romanos commentarij doctissimi was first published in 1558. Donnelly, Kingdon, and Anderson, 18.

⁴¹"First commeth in place, that which is common unto all mortall men: for the sonne of God, because he tooke upon him the nature of man, is joined with all men" (CP [3], 77-8). The Latin reads: "Primum id occurrit, quod omnibus mortalibus est commune. Dei enim filius, quia suscepit humanam naturam, cum omnibus hominibus conjunctus est." LC, 353.

peculiar to Christians. It is a natural communion, based on the biological or genetic "flesh and blood" connections between all men.⁴² While this material relationship is generalis, it is yet infirma, since the natures of unregenerate man and of Christ are so very different: Christ's human nature is pure, but ours is polluted.⁴³ In pointing to this conjunction, Martyr is merely emphasizing the likeness of kind between Christ and his fellow men. Therefore, Martyr turns in another direction to define "what it is to be in Christ."⁴⁴

Only by the work of the Holy Spirit can the nature of man be reconditioned

⁴²CP [3], 78: "For seeing they have fellowship with flesh and blood, as testifieth the epistle to the Hebrews, he also was made partaker of flesh and blood. But this conjunction is generall, and weake, and onlie (as I may terme it) according to the matter" The Latin reads: "Nam cum ipsi commercium habeant cum carne & sanguine, ut testatur Epistola ad Hebr, ipse quoque carnis & sanguinis factus est particeps. Sed ista conjunctio generalis est & infirma, tantum, ut ita dicam, juxta materiam" (LC, 353). Note that Hebrews 2:14 was also cited by Martyr in his correspondence to Calvin and Beza. Again, there is nothing in Martyr's argument that does not also apply to the relationship between any two human beings.

⁴³"But this conjunction is generall, and weake, and onlie (as I may terme it) according to the matter: for the nature of man far differeth from that nature which Christ tooke upon him. For the humane nature in Christ, is both immortall, and exempted from sinne, and adorned with all purenes: but our nature is unpure, corruptible, and miserablie polluted with sinne" (CP [3], 78). The first word of the above quote is the turning point of Martyr's thought in this section of the Loci Communes.

⁴⁴Martyr begins considering rhetorically: "Now must we see, what it is to be in Christ" (CP [3], 77). The Latin reads: "Videre jam oportet, quid sit esse in Christo" (LC, 353). He first turns to consider natural communion: "First commeth in place, that which is common unto all mortall men: for the sonne of God, because he tooke upon him the nature of man, is joined with all men" (CP [3], 77-8). The Latin reads: "Primum id occurrit, quod omnibus mortalibus est commune. Dei enim filius, quia suscepit humanam naturam, cum omnibus hominibus conjunctus est" (LC, 353). However, Martyr quickly adds that our pollution makes us quite different by nature from Christ, so that he points elsewhere for the true meaning of "in Christ."

after the image of Christ.⁴⁵ To be "in him after such a sort" is the biblical image.⁴⁶

Therefore, the remainder of the excursus from Martyr's commentary on Romans 8 in the Loci Communes explicitly applies only to regenerate Christians.⁴⁷ Here the remaining two degrees of union with Christ are outlined, although perhaps not as fully as in Martyr's correspondence.⁴⁸ The earlier date of this material may account for this difference in development.⁴⁹ Thus, the major outlines of Martyr's threefold union with

⁴⁵"... our nature is unpure, corruptible, and miserable polluted with sinne: but if the same be indued with the spirit of Christ, it is so repaired, as it differeth not much from the nature of Christ." CP [3], 77-78.

⁴⁶CP [3], 78: "Wherefore the Apostle pronounceth them free from sinne, which do abide in Christ, and are in him after such a sort, as I have now declared; to the end that they may live his life, be of the same mind that he is, and bring forth such fruit of works as differ not from his fruits." LC 353: "Eos itaque Apostolus pronunciat liberatos esse a peccato, qui manent in Christo, & in eo sunt eo modo, quo jam exposuimus, ut vitam ejus vivant, idem cum eo sentiant, & fructus operum non diversos a fructibus ejus edant." After turning his argument from natural communion to regeneration, Martyr displays this conviction by referring to six New Testament passages in quick succession: Ephesians 5:30, I Corinthians 2:16, Philippians 2:5, Romans 6:15, John 15:5, and Ephesians 5:23. It is also noteworthy that not until turning to regeneration does Martyr use the biblical phrase "in Christ."

⁴⁷CP [3], 78. Martyr later reinforces this division between the regenerate and the unregenerate: "It is a mere imagination brought by our adversaries, that there can be withered and dead members in the bodie of Christ, the which may be reniued againe. A member that is dead, is a member no more, neither yet ought to be called a member . . ." (CP [3], 79). Thus, Martyr clearly denies that the unregenerate are members of the body of Christ.

⁴⁸The titles "mystical" and "spiritual" communion are not used here. Martyr does, however, draw out two dimensions of the regenerate's union with Christ: one a definitive act of grafting, the other a dynamic process of nourishment (see CP [3], 78). These two categories correspond to Martyr's division of mystical and spiritual communion in his correspondence. Both apply only to those in whom the Holy Spirit lives, and only then does Martyr apply the biblical image of "ingrafting." The Johannine ingrafting theme is one of Martyr's favorites. See, for example, CP [2], 624, CP [2], 629, and CP [Appendix], 124-126.

⁴⁹Although the Loci Communes was first published in 1576, the material in this section was drawn from Martyr's Romans commentary, which was first published in

Christ are present in his earlier writing on the subject.

Christ's Conception

The key matter with regard to this present investigation is that incarnational communion is seen as universal yet infirm. Yet why is this relation both so general and so weak? One approach to answering this question is to examine Martyr's understanding of the incarnation in more detail. Precisely how does he envision the incarnation as having occurred? The Loci Communes goes into great detail on the specific mechanics of Christ's conception when expounding the Apostles' Creed.⁵⁰ These details help shed further light on the nature of Martyr's doctrine of incarnational communion with Christ.

Martyr firmly believes in the virgin birth of Christ and sees it as ensuring that the Saviour was born without original sin.⁵¹ Mary's biological and genetic contribution to her son was purified by the Holy Spirit who overshadowed her, the result being the creation of "a singular and perfect man."⁵² The body of Christ was prepared by this

1558 but was based on his Oxford lectures of 1550-1552. Donnelly, Kingdon, and Anderson, 18.

⁵⁰This moving exposition by Martyr of the Apostles' Creed is found in CP [2], 612-640.

⁵¹"Wherefore, to exempt Christ, according to the flesh, from the common fall of all mankind, so as he might ever reteinne his own nature; the wisdom of God decreed by a wonderful counsell, that man, which was to be assumed in the unitie of person, should have a beginning, both divine and humane." CP [2], 616.

⁵²"For this cause, as it had beene foreshewed by the angell unto Marie, so the holie Ghost came downe into her, and by the principall power thereof, the blood being now purified by his grace, did create a singular and perfect man, which the merciful God, even God, which was the word from everlasting, did miraculously take upon him." CP [2], 616.

purification, whereas his soul was immediately created perfect by God.⁵³ Thus, Martyr considers the cleansing of Mary's seed, which results in Christ's original righteousness, to be properly the work of the Holy Spirit.

Martyr is comfortable drawing close connections between the body of Christ and the body of Adam before the Fall.⁵⁴ Martyr also draws a close connection between the cleansing of Mary's blood at the incarnation and the later regeneration of the elect at their conversion. Both the cleansing of the precursor to Christ's human nature and the cleansing of the elect involve a "heaping of divine gifts" upon human nature.⁵⁵

In the only major study of Martyr's doctrine of man to date, Donnelly has shown that the Italian Reformer is true to his Aristotelian and Thomist roots.⁵⁶

⁵³"Insomuch as the wombe of the virgine Marie, and holy mothere was the divine furnace, whereby the holie Ghost, of a matter well purified, builded this one onelie bodie, which was a most obedient instrument of a noble soule. And by this means, all the old blemishes of Adam were alienated from Christ . . ." (CP[2], 616). Donnelly shows that Martyr was an immediate creationist instead of a transducianist: "the soul is created sinless but becomes contaminated by original sin as soon as joined to a body which descends from Adam." See Donnelly, *Calvinism and Scholasticism*, 91-92, 112. The purification of Mary's blood prevents this contamination in the case of Jesus.

⁵⁴"And by this means, all the old blemishes of Adam were alienated from Christ, albeit that his bodie, as concerning the nature and form of creation, was not much disagreeable from the bodie of Adam. For our first parent Adam also was marvellouslie, and by divine power created out of the earth, without accustomed seed." CP [2], 616-617.

⁵⁵" . . . [W]ho so is regenerated by Christ, must call to remembrance, what and how great hath beene the love of God towards us, who disdained not our soul and uncleane nature; but cleansing the same, did cloth himselfe therewith, to make us partakers of his divine nature. . . . [T]he divine word hath cleansed our nature, by heaping of divine gifts upon the same. And this is not onelie to be understood, touching that man [i.e., Christ], which it assumed; but all them, which with him in true faith be joined together as members of him." CP [2], 617.

⁵⁶Terming Martyr's philosophy of man as "popular Aristotelianism," Donnelly concludes his long chapter on Martyr's anthropology: "Aside from the rational

Martyr's works "are in fact shot through with the Aristotelian principles of being."⁵⁷

Using the four Aristotelian causes, Martyr analyzes the full union that regenerate believers have with Christ.⁵⁸ His conceptions of substance/accidents, matter/form, and person are also all traditional.⁵⁹ Therefore, Donnelly concludes, Martyr can "insist that man has the same substance (that he is the same individual and remains in the same species) even after the resurrection and its gift of risen qualities."⁶⁰

This same note of continuity is seen in Martyr's understanding of the incarnation itself: the substance of Mary, which is purified by the Holy Spirit, remains human substance even after it is changed by God. Thus, when Martyr calls natural communion with Christ "tantum, ut ita dicam, juxta materiam," he is very specifically highlighting the continuity between Christ and man, even in his fallen state. In

indemonstrability of the soul's immortality and the enumeration of the internal senses, almost all of Martyr's teaching in this chapter have direct parallels in Thomas Aquinas" (Donnelly, Calvinism and Scholasticism, 100). In a lengthy review, J. C. McLelland praises Donnelly's treatment of Martyr's anthropology as a "solid analysis" (J. C. McLelland, "Calvinism Perfecting Thomism? Peter Martyr Vermigli's Question," 574). See also McLelland, "Peter Martyr Vermigli: Scholastic or Humanist?", 150.

⁵⁷Donnelly, Calvinism and Scholasticism, 72.

⁵⁸"Hereby it is manifest, in what sort faithfull and godlie men are in Christ; and that by all the kinds of causes. For Christ and we have all one matter, also we have the selfe-same first entrances of forme: for we are indued with the selfe-same notes, properties, and conditions which he had. The efficient cause whereby we are moved to worke, is the same spirit whereby he was moved. Lastlie, the end is all one; namelie, that the glorie of God may be advanced" (CP [3], 78). For a discussion of the material, formal, effective, and final causes, see Donnelly, Calvinism and Scholasticism, 157-158.

⁵⁹Donnelly, Calvinism and Scholasticism, 71-74. For example, "Martyr accepts the traditional definition: a person is an individual substance of a rational nature." Donnelly, Calvinism and Scholasticism, 73.

⁶⁰Donnelly, Calvinism and Scholasticism, 72.

declaring the incarnational conjunction to be generalis, Martyr is pointing to this continuity of substance. In declaring the incarnational conjunction to be infirmis, however, Martyr is pointing to their profound discontinuity of accident.⁶¹ Only after regeneration by the Holy Spirit can a fallen man be said to have a continuity of accident with Jesus Christ.⁶² This continuity of accident also applies to Christ and Adam before the Fall.⁶³

Vermigliana Secondary Literature

The important matter of union with Christ--even incarnational communion--has not gone unnoticed by scholars of Peter Martyr Vermigli. Anderson calls attention to Martyr's correspondence with Calvin on union with Christ, noting that "Martyr broached the question in his revisions for the *Consensus* which Calvin could not insert at the last moment."⁶⁴ In his article on Martyr's Romans commentary, repeated references to the doctrine testify to its importance in the Reformer's understanding of sanctification.⁶⁵ The longest treatment of union with Christ in Martyr's thought is

⁶¹"... [F]or the nature of man far differeth from that nature which Christ tooke upon him. For the humane nature in Christ, is both immortall, and exempted from sinne, and adorned with all purenes: but our nature is unpure, corruptible, and miserable polluted with sinne" CP [3], 78.

⁶²"... [O]ur nature is unpure, corruptible, and miserable polluted with sinne: but if the same be indued with the spirit of Christ, it is so repaired, as it differeth not much from the nature of Christ." CP [3], 77-78.

⁶³Christ, however, "excelled Adam in all excellent gifts of nature." CP [2], 617.

⁶⁴Anderson, "Peter Martyr, Reformed Theologian (1542-1562)," 58.

⁶⁵Anderson, "Peter Martyr on Romans," 401-420.

given in Anderson's Peter Martyr: A Reformer in Exile (1542-1562).⁶⁶ This ten-page treatment is decidedly historical in emphasis; Anderson's goal is apparently to show that Martyr's exegesis may well have shaped Calvin's understanding of the doctrine.⁶⁷ He does not treat incarnational communion.

Donnelly devotes a brief section to Martyr's doctrine of union with Christ, noticing the fundamental difference between the Saviour's communion with men in general and the regenerate in particular.⁶⁸ The grounding of union with Christ in predestination is stressed by Donnelly, but this "material union" is not developed further.⁶⁹ Donnelly's brief section on union with Christ in Martyr's theology is commended by McLelland, who wished that it had been longer.⁷⁰

McLelland's interest in union with Christ dates back to his New College Ph.D. dissertation, completed in April 1953 under the supervision of T. F. Torrance and

⁶⁶Anderson, Peter Martyr, 186-195.

⁶⁷Anderson's style is woodenly factual and his line of logic convoluted. He spins a web of multiple names, dates, and events, finally drawing a conclusion that is most difficult to follow. His main concern is to suggest that Martyr, rather than Bucer, influenced Calvin's view of progressive sanctification through his doctrine of union with Christ. He concludes, "After Martyr's *I Corinthians* (1551), letters to Calvin and Beza of 1555 and *Romans* of 1558, Calvin spoke about union with Christ. Martyr left his mark on Calvin's theology." Anderson, Peter Martyr, 194. See also John Calvin, Calvin: Theological Treatises, trans. and ed. J. K. S. Reid (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954), 292 [CO 9:490-491].

⁶⁸"For Martyr justification brings man into a new relation with Jesus Christ. Since the incarnation there has been a material union based on the Word's assumption of human nature. Christ shares flesh and blood with all men, but the justified achieve a higher union with Christ, a union by insertion into Christ." Donnelly, Calvinism and Scholasticism, 157.

⁶⁹Donnelly, Calvinism and Scholasticism, 157-158.

⁷⁰McLelland, "Calvinism Perfecting Thomism? Peter Martyr Vermigli's Question," 575.

published in 1957 without significant revision.⁷¹ This work on Martyr's view of the sacraments is divided into three parts, the second of which is entitled "Union with Christ" and sets out Martyr's teaching on the church, baptism, and eucharist.

However, it is in two shorter sections that McLelland specifically treats incarnational communion, each citing Martyr's letters to Calvin and Beza.⁷²

The first section that discusses natural communion with Christ is titled "The O.T. Saints as Members of Christ." Explaining the relationship between the incarnation and Old Testament believers, McLelland mentions Martyr's teaching:

By His Incarnation, Christ effected a "general union" with all mankind, weak and "material" but real and of ultimate significance for revelation.⁷³

McLelland then passes on to Christ's spiritual communion with Old Testament saints.

What is noteworthy here is that this is the only time McLelland ever treats Martyr's clear theme that natural communion by virtue of the incarnation is debilis and infirmus.⁷⁴ McLelland draws no particular conclusions from the fact that this degree of

⁷¹Joseph C. McLelland, "The Doctrine of the Sacraments in the Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli (A.D. 1500-1562)" (Ph.D. diss., University of Edinburgh, 1953); J.C. McLelland, The Visible Words of God.

⁷²These are found on pages 88-91 and 142-147 of McLelland's Visible Words of God, the published form of his Ph.D. dissertation. The importance of the doctrine of union with Christ in McLelland's eyes should not be downplayed. In one article he calls union with Christ "perhaps the distinctive characteristic and contribution of his [Martyr's] theology . . ." (McLelland, "Calvinism Perfecting Thomism? Peter Martyr Vermigli's Question," 575). In another article he designates union with Christ "the literal heart of his [Martyr's] theology, yet one still neglected by recent research" (McLelland, "Peter Martyr Vermigli: Scholastic or Humanist?", 150). It is odd that something so important to him has not been dealt with in more detail in his own work.

⁷³McLelland, Visible Words of God, 88.

⁷⁴The theme is mentioned in a long block quote at the beginning of the later section, but merits no comment on that occasion.

union is "weak."⁷⁵ Instead, he stresses that it is "real and of ultimate significance for revelation," smothering Martyr's debilis with other theological concerns.⁷⁶

The later section in the dissertation where McLelland discusses incarnational communion with Christ is titled "Union and Communion" and deals principally with the believer's union with Christ. McLelland does, however, correlate it with incarnational communion:

Christ actually joins Himself to man by two unions: by Incarnation and by Spirit. The latter presupposes the former, and together they reveal a union as close as it is complete. . . . In terms of the Incarnation, every man is 'in Christ'. But the second union means that Christ is 'in us', for His properties are truly put into us, properties that are not 'natural' as those of the first, general union were: freedom over sin, eternal life, even incorruptibility.⁷⁷

Martyr's letters to Calvin and Beza are then correlated with these two degrees of union and used to introduce the mean between them: the believer's mystical union with Christ.

The significance of this section for Martyr's doctrine of incarnational communion is that the watch-words debilis and infirmia have dropped from McLelland's

⁷⁵The selective use of quotation marks in the block quote above is McLelland's. In truth, Martyr does use the term "weak" side-by-side with the terms "general" and "material."

⁷⁶Martyr does not specifically claim that incarnational communion is important for revelation. This is, rather, one of McLelland's theological deductions that cannot be substantiated by the material examined in the present study. The main question McLelland is addressing in this section is a good one: "But does not this presuppose the Incarnation as historical actuality, and so deny the O.T. saints membership in this same Christ which we have for our Head?" McLelland appears, however, to compress the importance of the incarnate Christ as the ante-type of Old Testament revelation into the incarnation itself, which is in turn compressed into incarnational union. McLelland, Visible Words of God, 88-91.

⁷⁷McLelland, Visible Words of God, 142-143.

comments altogether. Martyr is intent on stressing the paucity of effects that flow from men solely having flesh and blood like Jesus. McLelland's terminology is, however, at best ambiguous and could even convey exactly the opposite meaning. Martyr's language is much more cautious than McLelland's blanket claim in the block quote above. While Martyr admits the incarnation produces a natural communion between Christ and all humans, his use of the key biblical phrase "in Christ" is more restrained and qualified. He does not attach it to mere natural communion: for Martyr, all men are not "in Christ" or "engrafted into Christ."⁷⁸ In this way, the nature of Martyr's doctrine of incarnational communion has been obscured by exclusively stressing its extent.

Between the time McLelland completed his dissertation and its publication in Britain and America, his first article on Peter Martyr appeared in the Scottish Journal of Theology.⁷⁹ Arguing that Martyr did not believe in double predestination, McLelland proposes that union with Christ is the key to a proper understanding of

⁷⁸See footnote 93. When considering the biblical phrase "in Christ," J. S. Stewart chided Deissmann's more aggressive interpretation: "Having made his discovery, he is inclined to apply it everywhere without exception. He forces his key into every lock. He gives to certain passages a weight more than the words can really bear" (see J. S. Stewart, A Man in Christ [London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935], 157-158). Has McLelland done the same with Martyr?

⁷⁹Unfortunately, McLelland's name was misspelled when printed. J. C. McClelland [sic], "The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination According to Peter Martyr," Scottish Journal of Theology 8 (1955): 255-271. During this time, the Scottish Journal of Theology was edited by McLelland's former Ph.D. supervisor, T. F. Torrance. The occasion for McLelland's writing was Barth's juxtaposition of his "impressive critical analysis" of predestination and his "historically misleading" claim that Peter Martyr's proper treatment of predestination occurred "after Calvin." See McClelland [sic], 255-256; and Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics II/2, ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1957), 84.

predestination because it provides the right christological context for the doctrine.⁸⁰ In short, union with Christ is "the normative dogma of Reformed theology."⁸¹

In the final three paragraphs of the article, McLelland struggles with the mysteries of rejection and iniquity. He concludes the first of these three paragraphs with the observation that Martyr saw God's will as the final, but not the efficient, cause of these phenomena.⁸²

The second of these three paragraphs opens stressing "the positive doctrine that informs all Peter Martyr's theology: *faith means union with Christ*."⁸³ McLelland next claims that predestination is "specifically related to" union with Christ, giving a "striking example of this" in Martyr's use of predestination to explain infant baptism.

McLelland then concludes the paragraph:

Or again, Martyr makes much of the fact that by His Incarnation Christ united *all* men to Himself, and only on the basis of this universal union with Christ is the inward union of faith possible.⁸⁴

The third and final of these paragraphs resolves the dilemmas of rejection and

⁸⁰McLelland's claim that Peter Martyr Vermigli did not believe in double predestination has been dismissed by more recent scholarship. For example, see Frank A. James III, "A Late Medieval Parallel in Reformation Thought: *Gemina Praedestinatio* in Gregory of Rimini and Peter Martyr Vermigli," in Via Augustini: Augustine in the Latter Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Reformation; essays in honor of Damasus Trapp, ed. H. A. Oberman and F. A. James, III in cooperation with E. L. Saak (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991), 183.

⁸¹McClelland [sic], 255 and 270.

⁸²McClelland [sic], 270.

⁸³McClelland [sic], 270. The emphasis is McLelland's.

⁸⁴McClelland [sic], 271. This is the first explicit reference to incarnational union in McLelland's article. No specific references to substantiate this sweeping claim are given.

iniquity in light of the doctrine of union with Christ:

The mystery of rejection, like the mystery of iniquity itself, can be rationalized as much by rescuing God from all contact with it as by assigning it to his will. But what must save the doctrine of predestination from a logic which perverts the Gospel into the half-will of a rationalized Deity is the Christological context and content: *in Christ* and *into Christ*. And precisely here the distinctive contribution of Peter Martyr to the theology of the Reformation has ultimate relevance, for he was explicit where others were implicit in referring all theology to this Christological touchstone.⁸⁵

McLelland's final footnote points to John Calvin as an example of one who agreed with Martyr's more explicit doctrine of union with Christ.

If McLelland's statements on Martyr's doctrine of incarnational communion were ambiguous in his dissertation, then his first article in the Scottish Journal of Theology removes the ambiguity. McLelland gets so caught up in the glories of Christ's spiritual union with the regenerate and a desire to protect God from Calvinistic forms of logic, that he appears to inflate natural union and the use Martyr makes of the doctrine. Here natural communion with Christ has been elevated to new heights. No longer is it a thing of great weakness--debilis and infirmum--producing no substantive effects in the lives of those it touches. Rather, it is the new hinterground of meaning in light of which all theology is now to be defined. It is even something of which "Martyr makes much," which from our research appears most doubtful.

Instead, Martyr's doctrine of natural communion with Christ appears to have been redeployed--and in the process inescapably reshaped--by McLelland. Proceeding by paraphrase at this pivotal point in his line of historical reasoning, the raw material of Peter Martyr Vermigli has been reforged into a fundamental part for the Barthian

⁸⁵McClelland [sic], 271.

engine that McLelland is seeking to build.⁸⁶ Though creative, this theological move is, however, one which Martyr did not make. McLelland has so selectively emphasized the extent of incarnational communion in Martyr's theology as to reconstruct the true nature of it. McLelland's conclusions are best understood as reflecting the mid-twentieth-century context in which they appear.

⁸⁶For example, the whole warp and woof of Martyr's treatment of incarnational union is based on a comparison of the spiritual lives of Christians, Turks and Jews--a fact hardly compatible with Barth's aversion to natural theology.

APPENDIX 13

MELVILLE SCOTT AND T. F. TORRANCE: MORE THAN A REMARKABLE COINCIDENCE?

Such a conspicuous agreement between writers so widely separate in place and in time presents a remarkable phenomenon. Melville Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 108-9.

In a recent study of T. F. Torrance's theology, an eye-catching mixed metaphor begs for historical clarification:

Melville Scott refers to the Son's taking our fallen flesh to Himself as the "cornerstone" of the Athanasian arch and it is the same in Torrance. It is fundamental to his thought on the mediatorial work of Christ.¹

That the fallen humanity of Christ is a critical part of T. F. Torrance's theology is beyond question.² That it was a critical part of Athanasius' theology is not.³ But the

¹C. Baxter Kruger, "Participation in the Self-Knowledge of God: The Nature and Means of our Knowledge of God in the Theology of T. F. Torrance" (Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1989), 154. The work cited, which gives the strange mixed metaphor, is Melville Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement (Stafford: J. & C. Mort Ltd., 1914).

²For example, see T. F. Torrance, Conflict and Agreement in the Church, vol. 1, Order and Disorder (London: Lutterworth Press, 1959), 149; T. F. Torrance, The School of Faith (London: James Clarke & Co., 1959), lxxxv-lxxxvii; T. F. Torrance, Theology in Reconstruction (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1965), 241, 247, 255; T. F. Torrance, The Mediation of Christ (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1983), 48-50; T. F. Torrance, The Christian Frame of Mind (Edinburgh: Handsel Press, 1985), 9-10; T. F. Torrance, The Trinitarian Faith (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988), 154-65; and T. F. Torrance, Karl Barth: Biblical and Evangelical Theologian (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1990), 228-34; to name only a few.

³For example, see R. P. C. Hanson, The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988), 446-58; and J. Quasten, Patrology, vol. 3 (Utrecht:

lingering question is, Who was this Melville Scott?⁴

In another Aberdeen dissertation, the mysterious Melville Scott is cited six times in so many pages at an important juncture in the work.⁵ Scott corroborates the conclusion that for Athanasius:

"redemption was *in* Christ rather than *by* Christ"; mediation is not something which Christ *does* for us so much as something which he *is* for us. Again, therefore, we see the urgency of christological statement for soteriological considerations, and the motive for Athanasius's passionate and untiring defense of Nicene orthodoxy.⁶

In one long block quote from Orationes Contra Arianos II, Scott's translation is even preferred to that of the edition regularly cited in the text.⁷ But again, no clue is given as to the identity or background of this modern-day theological Melchizedek, Melville Scott, whose patristic and dogmatic insight is to be considered so incisive.⁸

Spectrum, 1960), 72-6. Hanson and Quasten agree that for Athanasius Christ had no human soul, which can hardly be squared with a fallen humanity. Kelly leaves the specific issue of fallenness untreated. J. N. D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, 5th ed. (London: A & C Black, 1977), 377-80.

⁴This is the only citation by Kruger of Scott. Due to the truncated form employed in footnoting, the reader is left unaware of precisely when Athanasius on the Atonement was written, unless he ventures into the Secondary Source section of Kruger's bibliography on page 369. Its 1914 date obviously raises the issue whether Torrance was influenced by Scott's work or not.

⁵Trevor Hart, "Two Models of Salvation in Relation to Christological Understanding in the Patristic East" (Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1989), 246-252. Hart's research, as well as that of Kruger, was completed under the supervision of T. F. Torrance's younger brother, J. B. Torrance.

⁶Hart, 246-7. The passage quoted by Hart is Scott, 30.

⁷Hart, 251.

⁸Melville Scott is not mentioned in J. Quasten, Patrology, vol. 3 or in E. P. Meijering, Orthodoxy and Platonism in Athanasius: Synthesis or Antithesis? (Leiden: E. J. Brill), 1968. Scott's Athanasius on the Atonement is not held in either the National Library of Scotland or the British Library. See The British Library General

Who Was Melville Scott?

Melville Scott was born in 1860 at Oakbrook, Derby, the son of the Venerable Melville Horne Scott, Archdeacon of Stafford and Canon of Lichfield.⁹ The nephew of the eminent British architect Sir George Gilbert Scott (1811-1878),¹⁰ Melville Scott was a great-grandson of Thomas Scott (1747-1821), the well-known Calvinist and Bible commentator.¹¹

After attending both Christ Church, Oxford and Christ's College, Cambridge, Scott was a lecturer at Gloucester Theological College from 1885 to 1888 and was particularly known for his Old Testament critical work.¹² In 1914 he was awarded a

Catalogue of Printed Books to 1975, vol. 296 (London: K. G. Saur, 1985), 236.

⁹J. S. Horne, The Story of Castle Church, Stafford (Gloucester: British Publishing Co., 1963), 14; Melville Scott, The Force of Love (Derby: Bemrose & Sons, 1899), 89.

¹⁰For Melville Scott's relation to Sir George Gilbert Scott, see Horne, 14; and Melville Scott, The Force of Love, 14-20. Sir George Gilbert Scott was knighted for designing the Albert Memorial in London and numerous other projects. On Sir George Gilbert Scott, see "Scott, Sir George Gilbert", Dictionary of National Biography, vol. 17, ed. Sidney Lee (London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1909), 957-61.

¹¹Melville Scott, The Force of Love, 4-14. Thomas Scott's The Force of Truth, which was stylistically revised by William Cowper, is still in print today, although his Bible commentary in its original form is not. See Thomas Scott, The Force of Truth (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1984 [reprint of 1779 edition]). A portion of his Bible commentary was later incorporated with Matthew Henry's Exposition under the editorship of G. Stokes in 1835. The resulting work was first known as Henry and Scott's Commentary, but today is commonly known as Matthew Henry's Bible Commentary. On Thomas Scott, see "Scott, Thomas," Dictionary of National Biography, vol. 17, ed. Sidney Lee (London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1909), 1011-3 and "Scott, Thomas," The Imperial Dictionary of Universal Biography, vol. 3, division 16 (London: William Mackenzie, no date), 750.

¹²"Scott, Melville," Crockford's Clerical Directory for 1925 (London: Oxford University Press, 1925), 1353-4; Horne, 14; "Prebendary Melville Scott," Times (London), 16 April 1929, 21c.

D.D. from Dublin and in 1927 earned a Th.D. from the University of Strasbourg for his Textual Discoveries in Proverbs, Psalms, and Isaiah (1927).¹³ The Old Testament scholar's eight other works display a particular interest in the doctrine of the atonement, as well as a profoundly devotional emphasis.¹⁴ Melville Scott died on 14 April 1929.¹⁵

Athanasius on the Atonement

Initial reaction to Melville Scott's Athanasius on the Atonement came quickly.

¹³Melville Scott, Textual Discoveries in Proverbs, Psalms, and Isaiah (London: SPCK, 1927), ii; "Scott, Melville," Who Was Who 1929-1940, vol. III (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1941), 1208; and "Scott, Melville," Crockford's Clerical Directory for 1925, 1353. "Prebendary Melville Scott": "Scott's method was to "offer conjectural emendations which, though without manuscript authority, help the reader to overcome the difficulties of the author It was his belief that conjectural emendation is absolutely necessary in any attempt to revise the text of the Old Testament." Scott also practiced this art with the New Testament, apparently driven by dogmatic concerns. See Melville Scott, Crux Crucis: the problem of the atonement (Harrogate: R. Ackrill, 1907), 50-1, where Scott offers altered readings for Romans 3:24, 4:23, and 5:9, Galatians 2:17 and 4:32, Ephesians 2:13, Hebrews 10:19, and Revelation 1:15.

¹⁴The title of his first book, The Force of Love, was an obvious variation on his famous Calvinistic forefather's work The Force of Truth, noted by the Bishop of Lichfield in the preface of the great-grandson's book. This work chronicles the life of Melville Scott's father. On the doctrine of the atonement Melville Scott wrote four works: Crux Crucis: the problem of the atonement (Harrogate: R. Ackrill, 1907); The Atonement (London: George Allen & Sons, 1910); The Christian Covenant (London: George Allen & Sons, 1912); and Athanasius on the Atonement. Other works included The Harmony of the Proper Psalms for the Fasts and Festivals of the Church Year: A devotional exposition (London: Bemrose & Sons, 1905) and The Message of Hosea (London: SPCK, 1921). His The Harmony of the Collects, Epistles and Gospels: Being a devotional exposition of the continuous teaching of the Church throughout the year (London: Bemrose & Sons, 1902) went into at least four editions, as well as translations into Chinese and Japanese. See Horne, 14; "Prebendary Melville Scott"; and The British Library General Catalogue of Printed Books to 1975, 236.

¹⁵Horne, 14; "Prebendary Melville Scott," 21c.

The Expository Times included in its issue of June 1914 what amounted to little more than an advertisement of the work by Scott, which he later incorporated into the book as its Preface.¹⁶ In October of that same year, the book merited a short notice in the journal, albeit somewhat sarcastic in tone:

The Rev. Melville Scott, D.D., wisely pursuing his studies in the doctrine of the Atonement, has now published the result of a study of Athanasius. The title is Athanasius on the Atonement (Stafford: Mort). What is the result of his study of Athanasius? It is to find that his own theory already published has been anticipated by Athanasius and therefore has the orthodox stamp upon it. In his last chapter he shows that this theory, though so old as Athanasius, is the most modern of all theories, and the most acceptable to our modern minds.¹⁷

Presumably written by the editor James Hastings, no fuller review of the work was later given in the journal.

In 1915, J. K. Mozley reacted quite positively to Scott's new book. Almost the entire section on Athanasius in his The Doctrine of the Atonement was given over to a discussion of Melville Scott's findings.¹⁸ Although cautious, Mozley was obviously pleased with the work:

Dr. Melville Scott, in a book just published, makes out a case, which needs indeed critical examination, but is prima facie reasonable and strongly supported with quotations from the later writings, for holding that Athanasius progressed from his first view of the Atonement as an "external transaction" till it became for him an "internal process," a sanctification of human nature first in Christ, and so, potentially, in all men.¹⁹

¹⁶Melville Scott, "Preaching the Doctrine of the Atonement," Expository Times 25 (June 1914): 428-9.

¹⁷Expository Times 26 (October 1914): 38-9.

¹⁸J. K. Mozley, The Doctrine of the Atonement (London: Duckworth & Co., 1915), 105-7, 110.

¹⁹Mozley, 105.

Mozley noted particularly Scott's emphasis on the fallen human nature of Christ and its progressive redemption by the Saviour.²⁰

Hastings Rashdall also cited Scott's work on Athanasius in the printed form of his Bampton Lectures for 1915.²¹ Although only mentioned in a passing footnote, Rashdall's interest does reflect some limited awareness of Melville Scott's work in wider theological circles.²²

Scholars of Scottish descent were also not entirely unaware of Athanasius on the Atonement. John Dickie, former New College Lecturer, commended Scott's work as "a special treatise" in his The Organism of Christian Truth (1931):

There is a special treatise on Athanasius' Doctrine of the Atonement, published by Messrs J. & C. Mort, Stafford, to which Mr. Mozley often refers. The author is Dr. Melville Scott, who published a book on the Atonement through George Allen & Sons (London, 1910). This work follows traditional Anglican lines, and is, I think, of less theological importance than the historical study of Athanasius.²³

Thus, while not necessarily a household word, the name Melville Scott was not unknown in the Scottish theological world in which T. F. Torrance travelled.

²⁰Mozley, 105-6.

²¹Hastings Rashdall, The Idea of the Atonement in Christian Theology, Bampton Lectures for 1915 (London: Macmillan, 1919), 298.

²²Torrance lists this book by Rashdall in his Basel dissertation: T. F. Torrance, The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1948), 61.

²³John Dickie, The Organism of Christian Truth: A modern positive dogmatic (London: James Clarke, 1931), 261. The author wishes to express his appreciation to Mr. John McPake of New College for drawing this citation to his attention. Obviously, both James Hastings and John Dickie cannot be correct on the degree of continuity between Melville Scott's The Atonement and his Athanasius on the Atonement. See Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 69, where the earlier work is referenced. It is not entirely clear from Dickie's brief comments that he ever read both volumes.

Parallels Between Scott and Torrance

The similarity in thought and emphasis between Melville Scott and T. F. Torrance is quite striking. Even to the casual reader, they appear to have more in common than just a healthy interest in Athanasian christology and soteriology.²⁴ Although some differences may exist, the continuity of themes and concerns is remarkable, made all the more so because Scott is never once mentioned by Torrance in his nearly 600 books and articles.²⁵ These facts prompted the further investigation which follows.²⁶

Attitude to Athanasius

T. F. Torrance considers Athanasius his favorite theologian and cites the

²⁴The present author was struck by the parallels from the moment he opened Scott's book. In the short four-page preface to Scott's Athanasius on the Atonement, more than ten important parallels were noticed immediately.

²⁵On 20 November 1991 in an evening telephone call, Torrance confirmed this fact and said he had no dependence upon Athanasius on the Atonement: "I did not use it." He acknowledged an awareness of Melville Scott's work, which was brought to his attention later in life by George Dragas, one of his former students (1968-1972) who worked on Athanasius: George D. Dragas, Athanasiana: Essays in the Theology of Saint Athanasius (London: no publisher, 1980); George D. Dragas, St. Athanasius Contra Apollinarem, intro. by T. F. Torrance, issued as Church and Theology, vol. 6 (Athens: Church and Theology, 1985). A marked xerox copy of Scott's Athanasius on the Atonement is now in Torrance's personal library, which he kindly supplied to the author.

²⁶In the following subsections, only examples from each man's thought will be given. Obviously, an exhaustive list of citations would be excessive. Typical examples will be cited from Torrance's major works. Additional citations from Scott's other writings will be given only for clarification of references in his Athanasius on the Atonement. NB: citations from the preface of Athanasius on the Atonement are in lower case Roman numerals.

Alexandrian more often than any other, ancient or modern.²⁷ The whole Eastern Early Church tradition has played an important role in Torrance's theological development, as well as his presentation of dogmatic concepts.²⁸

The same can be said of Melville Scott.²⁹ He considered Athanasius to be "the most authoritative exponent of the Redemption of Christ" and "perhaps the greatest of all the Fathers."³⁰

Scott saw Athanasius standing in a particular school of theological thought stretching from Christ himself to the twentieth century. He linked the teaching of Athanasius through Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, Polycarp, and the Apostle John back to the Lord Jesus Christ.³¹ Moving forward in time, Scott joined Athanasius with the Cappadocian Fathers and John of Damascus, eventually rediscovering this ancient truth in his own day.³²

The boldness of assertion and grandness of sweep by Scott are reminiscent of

²⁷T. F. Torrance, Christ's Words (Jedburgh: Unity Press, 1980), 4. An icon of St. Athanasius hangs in Torrance's study, a copy of which was included in his book Trinitarian Faith. Kruger, 76-7.

²⁸For his most recent and comprehensive examples of this, see Torrance, Trinitarian Faith; Torrance, Divine Meaning; and Torrance, The Christian Doctrine of God, One Being Three Persons.

²⁹Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 5: "Of all the Fathers of the Early Church the one Father whose opinion counts for more than that of any other is undoubtedly S. Athanasius. In the first place he stands intellectually far above any of his contemporaries, and is still entitled to rank as an unique champion of orthodoxy."

³⁰Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 96-7.

³¹Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, x, 99-107, 109-110, 112.

³²Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, x, 95, 106, 109, 143, 145.

Torrance's own historical and literary method.³³

Third Christological School

Implied in Scott's historical treatment is the inadequacy of viewing Alexandrian theology as a single school of christological thought in opposition to the Antiochian school.³⁴ Notice who is missing from the time line he traces. Origen and Clement, while obviously from Alexandria, were for Scott not following Athanasius' same line of thought.³⁵

Torrance made this same observation, but without strong historical proof, nearly thirty years ago.³⁶ He repeated this claim in 1975.³⁷

³³This can best be seen in the footnotes of his Trinitarian Faith, which draws selectively on these and other Eastern sources. Torrance also includes the Reformers in his orthodox school. Torrance, The School of Faith, lxxx: "Reformed theology, as we have seen, deliberately returned to the ancient Catholic doctrine of Christ and made it quite central. The doctrine of the Ecumenical Councils, notably Chalcedon, was not taken over without further Biblical study and correction, notably in seeking to interpret the Person and Work of Christ closely together. Here for the first time since Athanasius and Cyril we have a really adequate doctrine of atonement"

³⁴Hart's dissertation deals primarily with this claim, showing that Bauer's division of early church christology into Alexandrian and Antiochian schools is an inadequate model. He also relates the second Eastern stream to Irenaeus, Athanasius, and the Cappadocians. See Hart.

³⁵Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 5: "Origen, for example, though worthy of far more study in regard to his soteriology than he has yet received, can hardly be regarded as wholly dependable. Clement of Alexandria was more concerned with the relation of Christianity to heathen philosophy than with the interpretation of particular parts of the Christian scheme. . . . Of all the Fathers of the Eastern Church the one Father whose opinion counts for more than that of any other is undoubtedly S. Athanasius."

³⁶"There was a tendency among the theologians of the Early Church to divide into two camps,--those of the Antiochian school who stressed the historical humanity of Jesus, and those of the Alexandrian school who stressed the eternal nature of Christ as divine Logos; but there was a third 'school', running from Irenaeus to Athanasius,

No Mere External Transaction

Melville Scott was profoundly unhappy with the external, forensic model of the atonement.³⁸ Because it was "out of touch with reality and life," Scott feared that the whole doctrine of the atonement might be rejected by the church of his day.³⁹ In his search for solutions, Scott found the Athanasian conception of atonement more suitable.⁴⁰ Thus, "the idea of Atonement as an external transaction gives place to the

which stressed the vicarious humanity of Jesus along with its stress upon the Deity and Lordship of Christ." T. F. Torrance, "The Place of the Humanity of Christ in the Sacramental Life of the Church," Church Service Society Annual 26 (1956): 4.

³⁷Torrance, Theology in Reconciliation, 225-6: "Moreover, Athanasius' consistent rejection of cosmological and epistemological dualism in his doctrine of Christ as well as in his doctrine of God enabled him to develop the Irenaeus (and even Origenist) understanding of salvation as the redemption of the *whole man*, which rather makes irrelevant the distorting distinction between a *Logos-sarx* and a *Logos-anthropos* approach which some scholars have employed as a framework for the interpretation of Patristic Christology." The scholar Torrance specifically has in mind here is Aloys Grillmeier, Christ in the Christian Tradition, trans. J. S. Bowden (London: A.R. Mowbray, 1965).

³⁸Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, xi: "The inwardness of the Cross being done away, all that remained was the Cross as an external transaction. So considered, the Cross becomes an insoluble problem, and the very ingenuity expended upon its solution renders it harder to preach, and harder to believe. . . . The modern world will not have it" Scott opposes "a purely forensic and transactional meaning." Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 143. Also see Scott, Crux Crucis, 116, where the forensic theory is described as "a theory masquerading in the garb of law, and parading legal fictions."

³⁹Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, ix: "This is, indeed, the essential thing, not merely in order to enable the doctrine of the Atonement to be preached, but in order to enable it to be accepted as a necessary part of the Catholic faith by Christian people today. We would endeavour to show very briefly that it is the difficulties here referred to which put this doctrine out of touch with reality and life, and that these difficulties are not really inherent, but are in fact excrescences due to the mistaken interpretation of this doctrine by Latin theology."

⁴⁰Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 135: "The Athanasian conception . . . looks upon the Atonement . . . not as an external transaction, but as the accomplishment of salvation in Christ"

idea of Atonement as a spiritual process."⁴¹ Scott was driven by a conserving tendency, a desire to retain a prominent place in contemporary Christianity for some conception of atonement.

The same can be said of T. F. Torrance, who also finds a merely external atonement "over our heads" and thus out of touch with men's lives.⁴² Athanasius is also a major figure whom Torrance credits with making this inadequacy plain.⁴³

Incarnation and Atonement

Vital to this internal salvation is the connection Scott saw between the doctrines of incarnation and atonement, which modern theology failed to make.⁴⁴ This new perspective transformed Scott's understanding of the atonement:

⁴¹Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 133.

⁴²Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 90: "On the other hand, if Jesus is a substitute in detachment from us, who simply acts in our stead in an external, formal or forensic way, then his response has no ontological bearing upon us but is an empty transaction over our heads. A merely representative or a merely substitutionary concept of vicarious mediation is bereft of any actual saving significance."

⁴³Torrance, Trinitarian Faith, 155: "Moreover, since Jesus Christ is himself God and man in one Person, and all his divine and human acts issue from his one Person, the atoning mediation and redemption which he wrought for us, fall *within* his own being and life as the one Mediator between God and man. That is to say, the work of atoning salvation does *not* take place *outside* Christ, as something external to him, but takes place *within* him, *within* the incarnate constitution of his Person as Mediator. The general parameters for this understanding of incarnational redemption had already been worked out by Athanasius in his early work *On the Incarnation* in which he argued for the divine validity and universal range of the saving work of Christ as the Word of God become man."

⁴⁴Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 74: "Modern theology has constantly treated the Atonement in isolation from the doctrine of the Incarnation. With Athanasius there were not so much two mysteries as one mystery, and the Atonement is regarded as the result of the Incarnation."

Thus the saving acts of Christ were no longer to Athanasius external transactions, but derived their efficacy from their connexion with His Person. Redemption was in Christ rather than by Christ.⁴⁵

The dogmatic acumen of this explanation was to Scott unrivaled.⁴⁶

Scott's development of this theological connection did not end there, however. He went on to press the implications of the connection between incarnation and atonement further, including the whole life and death of the incarnate Saviour in his idea of atonement.⁴⁷ Thus, the mere fact or isolated event of the incarnation was not enough.⁴⁸ "What was accomplished in Christ was not so much an act as a becoming," Scott concluded.⁴⁹

The importance of relating incarnation and atonement is also a key theme in

⁴⁵Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 30. This passage is cited by Hart, footnote 6, above.

⁴⁶Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 85: "This, which we have termed Atonement by means of an internal process is the deepest solution which theology has ever supplied to the mystery of the Atonement, and there cannot be a shadow of doubt that it was put forward by Athanasius."

⁴⁷Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 137: "Wrought into the very texture of the thought of S. Athanasius is the conviction that the problem of the Atonement finds its solution in the mystery of the Incarnation, so much is universally acknowledged. But the Incarnation alone can never afford a sufficient explanation of the Atonement, unless it is taken to include the Incarnate life and death of the Saviour."

⁴⁸Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 75: "It would not, however, be correct to think that Athanasius regards salvation as accomplished by the Incarnation, considered as a single event. Were this the case, he would be liable to the charge, not infrequently brought against Greek theologians, that he has no doctrine of the Atonement at all, but only a doctrine of the Incarnation."

⁴⁹The passage continues: "It was not so much by what He was, *i.e.*, by the mere fact of His Incarnation; it was not so much by what He did, *i.e.*, by the mere fact of His death, that Christ was the Highpriest of humanity, as by what He became, and by what humanity became in Him." Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 81.

Torrance's writings.⁵⁰ Drawing very heavily upon early and Greek patristics, Torrance sees the inner connection between the doctrines of the incarnation and the atonement as holding the answer to the problem of the atonement.⁵¹ Torrance also sees the wider implications for Christ's life which flow out of this theological intersection.⁵²

⁵⁰Torrance, God and Rationality, 64: "Hence we must allow the Person of Christ to determine for us the nature of His saving work, rather than the other way round. The detachment of atonement from incarnation is undoubtedly revealed by history to be one of the most harmful mistakes of Evangelical Churches." Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 73: "In him the Incarnation and Atonement are one and inseparable, for atoning reconciliation falls within the incarnate constitution of his Person as Mediator, and it is on that ground and from that source that atoning reconciliation embraces all mankind and is freely available to every person." Torrance, Theology in Reconciliation, 136: "Behind the latter movement of thought lies a high, non-dualist soteriology, in which incarnation and atonement are regarded as constituting a single, continuous indivisible movement of the redeeming love of God, and in which the saving life and passion of Christ as the one Mediator between God and man are understood in the mutual involution of his *God-manward* and his *man-Godward* activity."

⁵¹Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 50: "In the biblical and early patristic tradition, however, as we have seen, the Incarnation and the atonement are internally linked, for atoning expiation and propitiation are worked out in the ontological depths of human being and existence into which the Son of God penetrated as the Son of Mary." Torrance, Theology in Reconciliation, 10: "Moreover, through the Trinitarian orientation of the Greek Fathers, together with their doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and through the deep inter-relation of Incarnation and Atonement which they can learn from Athanasius and the balanced doctrine of justification, through the vicarious obedience of Christ taught by Cyril of Alexandria, they will find substantial and compelling ground for unity both with the Orthodox and with the Roman Catholic Church in which full justice can be done to the Evangelical as well as the Catholic mission of the Church."

⁵²Torrance, Karl Barth: Biblical and Evangelical Theologian, 229: "It is entirely consistent with this that the incarnation and atonement are to be understood in their mutual relations with each other. The incarnation includes the whole life and activity of Jesus Christ culminating in his resurrection and ascension, while the atonement begins from his very conception and birth when he put on the form of a servant and began to pay the price of our redemption." Torrance also integrates other doctrines into this relation. For example, see Torrance, Theology in Reconstruction, 241: "It is in the *Incarnation* and *Atonement* that we learn the secret of Pentecost."

Fallen Human Nature of Christ

The most important dogmatic prerequisite in Melville Scott's mind to this dynamic, life-long, redemptive "becoming" by Jesus Christ was his assumption of fallen humanity.⁵³ This doctrine was the "cornerstone" of "the Athanasian arch."⁵⁴ In the incarnation, Christ did not take up human nature as found before the Fall but after it.⁵⁵ To have done otherwise would have removed him far from us.⁵⁶ Such distance would in turn tear at the internal bond between Christ and man upon which our redemption depends.⁵⁷

Torrance is also centrally committed to the doctrine of Christ's fallen

⁵³Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, xi, 48-50, 59-60, 69, 89, 90-1, 96, 105, 121, to name only a few of the references.

⁵⁴Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 89: "The Athanasian arch was robbed of its cornerstone by the assertion that the nature assumed by Christ was the nature of Adam prior to his Fall, and thus was a nature which needed not to be redeemed in Christ. There could be no doctrine of internal process, when there was perfection at the outset." This is the mixed metaphor which helped spark original interest in this study. See footnote 1 above.

⁵⁵Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 121: "Athanasius uniformly teaches that Christ took human nature as it is in humanity, and for that reason what He took may be termed 'sin'. . . ." Scott disallowed that man's nature before and after the Fall are the same nature in two different conditions, but only after a tedious line of argument which ends in the following assumption: ". . . there is no appreciable difference between a condition of nature and a nature, when, as in this case, the condition of nature is a permanent condition. What is always present in a nature is not a condition of nature, but a part of nature." Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 93.

⁵⁶Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 90-1: "The supposition, and it can never be any more than a supposition, that Christ took the nature of a man, not as it was, but as it had once been, would remove Christ far away from mankind."

⁵⁷Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 90: "A view of the Atonement as an internal process . . . demands absolute identity between Christ and man Any insistence upon separation would tend to destroy the assurance of identity, the cornerstone of redemption."

humanity.⁵⁸ Although Torrance does not refer to it as the "cornerstone" of "the Athanasian arch," the Alexandrian does play a prominent role in his treatment of the doctrine.⁵⁹ Upon this crucial doctrine hangs Torrance's whole ability to conceive of redemption.⁶⁰

The Unassumed is the Unhealed

Scott conspicuously linked his doctrine of the fallen humanity of Christ to

⁵⁸Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 48-9: "That is to say, the Incarnation is to be understood as the coming of God to take upon himself our fallen human nature, our actual human existence laden with sin and guilt, our humanity diseased in mind and soul in its estrangement or alienation from the Creator." See footnote 2 above.

⁵⁹Torrance, Theology in Reconciliation, 230: "For Athanasius, it is everywhere apparent, the incarnational assumption of our fallen Adamic humanity from the Virgin Mary was essentially a sanctifying and redeeming event, for what Christ took up into himself, the whole man, he healed and renewed through his own holy life of obedient Sonship in the flesh, and his vicarious death and resurrection." Torrance, Trinitarian Faith, 161: "Thus Athanasius could say that 'the whole Christ became a curse for us', for in taking upon himself the form of a servant, the Lord transferred to himself fallen Adamic humanity which he took from the Virgin Mary, that is, our perverted, corrupt, degenerate, diseased human nature enslaved to sin and subject to death under the condemnation of God."

⁶⁰Torrance, School of Faith, lxxxvi: "Now in this active and passive obedience we are to think of Christ as dealing with our actual sins through the atoning exchange of His life and death and resurrection, but we cannot do that without also thinking of His incarnational union of our human nature with His divine nature as dealing with our original sin, or as sanctifying our fallen human nature through bringing it into healing and sanctifying union with holy divine nature. This is also supremely important, for it is only through this union of our human nature with His divine nature that Jesus Christ gives us not only the negative righteousness of the remission of sins but to share in the positive righteousness of His obedient and loving life lived in perfect filial relation on earth to the heavenly Father. If we neglect this essential element in the obedience of the Son, then not only do the active and passive obedience of Christ fall apart in our theology, but we are unable to understand justification in Christ as anything more than merely forensic non-imputation of sin. Moreover if we neglect this essential element we are unable to see the Humanity of Jesus in its saving significance, that is, to give the whole life of the historical Jesus its rightful place in the doctrine of atonement and recreation."

Gregory Nazianzen's adage: "The unassumed is the unhealed." This single phrase is the "watchword" for the doctrine of Christ's fallen humanity, according to Scott.⁶¹

Under Torrance "the unassumed is the unhealed" is elevated to a "soteriological principle."⁶² Although the Western church failed to pick up on it, Athanasius helped formulate the idea that Gregory Nazianzen and Cyril of Alexandria enshrined.⁶³

⁶¹Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, x: "This theory takes as its basis the fact of the Incarnation, and postulates our Lord's perfect, *i.e.*, complete, humanity. Its watchword as stated by Gregory Nazianzen in a single phrase is . . . 'What He did not assume He did not heal.'" Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 143: "Fortunately the real Athanasian doctrine was retained in its fulness by the Cappadocian Gregory Nazianzen, whose writings form the best possible commentary upon the true views of our Saint" Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 145: "It will be noticed that, as in the case of S. Athanasius, his main interest is soteriological. Gregory insists everywhere that any diminution of the saving manhood of Christ argues an equivalent diminution in the salvation extended to mankind, on the principle . . . 'that which He hath not assumed He hath not healed.'"

⁶²Torrance, Trinitarian Faith, 163: "This soteriological principle, that only what the incarnate Son has taken up from us into himself is saved, had been earlier enunciated by Origen, but now reinforced by Athanasius, it was given a central place in the teaching of the Cappadocian theologians." Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 48-9: "That is to say, the Incarnation is to be understood as the coming of God to take upon himself our fallen human nature, our actual human existence laden with sin and guilt, our humanity diseased in mind and soul in its estrangement or alienation from the Creator. This is a doctrine found everywhere in the early Church in the first five centuries, expressed again and again in terms that the whole man had to be assumed by Christ if the whole man was to be saved, that the unassumed is the unhealed, or that what God has not taken up in Christ is not saved." This usage is in addition to the typical Anti-Apollinarian sense in which it is taken. See Hart, 161.

⁶³Torrance, The Christian Frame of Mind, 9-10: "It is unfortunate, and very astonishing, that Latin theology never really appreciated the profound implications of the Greek Patristic principle that 'the unassumed is the unhealed'. Torrance, Theology in Reconciliation, 112: "Before we go on to discuss these questions further, however, we must consider another fact pointed out by Athanasius, that when the Lord for our sake became man it was impossible that the body he possessed should lack either soul or mind, for salvation pertains to the whole man, and it would be a myth if it extended to the body only. That is the very point variously expressed by Gregory of Nazianzus and Cyril of Alexandria: 'the unassumed is the unhealed', 'what has not been taken up has not been saved'."

Sinlessness of Christ

Does the doctrine of Christ's fallen human nature imply that Christ was a sinner? Scott claimed not.⁶⁴ Christ was "untouched" by "sinful tendencies."⁶⁵ Repeatedly, however, Scott pointed to the intense struggle in which Christ was engaged.⁶⁶ A "painful conflict and a civil war between the mind of the flesh and the mind of the spirit" raged in the bosom of our Saviour, said Scott.⁶⁷ Scott tried, however, to carefully qualify his definition of sin, excluding this struggle and its source in man's nature from the charge of sinfulness.⁶⁸

⁶⁴Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 69: "Such treatment is, of course, open to the serious objection that it detracts from our Lord's sinlessness, which, however, was as firmly believed in by Athanasius as by ourselves."

⁶⁵Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 145: "This distinction is vital. Our Lord was sin in the sense that He took the nature which tends to sin, and is the occasion of sin in us; He was not sin, in as much as He was untouched by these sinful tendencies, and so crucified them that 'He died unto sin.'"

⁶⁶For example, see Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 61, 63, 70, 79, 96, to name just a few.

⁶⁷Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 79: "There was no autocracy of the Divinity in the Person of Christ, but a constitutional monarchy of consent and preference, which consent and preference were only ceded after painful conflict and a civil war between the mind of the flesh and the mind of the spirit. Christ fought our battle, and only because He fought our battle did He win our victory." The Nestorian overtones of this "civil war" should not be overlooked. Also see Scott, The Atonement, 104-5, where Scott comments that Christ's fighting of this battle is "surely infinitely the more honourable" alternative to His reception "of an already purified nature."

⁶⁸Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 114, footnote 1: "Man has desires implanted in his nature, but as it was not sin in our first parents to have these desires, it cannot be sin in us." Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 123: "If Adam left me a vitiated nature, that was indeed sin in him, but how can it be sin in me? It may be my disadvantage, but in the same degree that it is my disadvantage, it must be held to be my excuse, for in the estimation of guilt we must not add but subtract disadvantages, if we would obtain the correct amount of indebtedness." Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 96: "There is something in man, which, if not resisted becomes sin, though it is not sin if it be resisted. There are congenital tendencies in man which are as much

In spite of his doctrine of the fallen humanity of Christ, Torrance also believed Christ led a sinless life.⁶⁹ At one point, Torrance even calls Christ's humanity "holy," in spite of its fallenness.⁷⁰ The exact moral parameters Torrance assigns to internal struggle against sin, however, are not completely clear.⁷¹

part of his nature as his intellect or his will. It is not sinful to have such tendencies, but it is sinful when we do not fight against them." Is it clear that Scott considered concupiscence a sin and, therefore, beyond the pale of Christ's life? Did Christ's human mind ever desire anything other than to glorify God and enjoy Him forever? With Scott's overriding emphasis upon internal struggle, rather than external struggle, it would seem so.

⁶⁹Torrance, Trinitarian Faith, 184: "We must also bear in mind the point we discussed above that when the holy Son of God took our sinful humanity upon himself, he did it in such a way that instead of sinning himself he brought his holiness to bear upon it so that it might be sanctified in him."

⁷⁰Torrance, God and Rationality (London: Oxford University Press, 1971), 160: "Although He entered into our fragmented and disintegrating existence and took His human nature from us, in His holy Humanity the rift between spiritual and physical existence which characterizes our fallen human nature has been healed." Torrance, Trinitarian Faith, 161: "Thus Athanasius could say that 'the whole Christ became a curse for us', for in taking upon himself the form of a servant, the Lord transferred to himself fallen Adamic humanity which he took from the Virgin Mary, that is, our perverted, corrupt, degenerate, diseased human nature enslaved to sin and subject to death under the condemnation of God. However, far from sinning himself or being contaminated by what he appropriated from us, Christ triumphed over the forces of evil entrenched in our human existence, bringing his own holiness, his own perfect obedience, to bear upon it in such a way as to condemn sin in the flesh and to deliver us from its power." Torrance, Trinitarian Faith, 162: "In his great compassion he did not reject union with our nature, fallen though it was as the result of sin, but gathered it up in himself in order to purify it and quicken it in his own sinless life-giving life."

⁷¹The specific issue would be concupiscence. In his Auburn lectures, Torrance clearly strives to avoid concupiscence (Torrance, "The Doctrine of Jesus Christ," 202-208). In his later corpus, there are also some occasions when Torrance appears to distance himself from concupiscence. For example: T. F. Torrance, Space, Time and Resurrection (Edinburgh: Handsel Press, 1976), 162: "It has to do also with the sheer holiness of the man, his translucent purity and simplicity, the unsullied truth of his being, the utter selflessness of his compassion, his complete lack of guile, insincerity or pretension--there is no inward darkness in Jesus but rather something like an excess of light." However, Torrance's overriding emphasis on the internal nature of Christ's

Progress Through Conflict

The civil war inside Christ's person was not incidental to Scott's theological system; in fact, it was fundamental. He saw conflict as an intimate part of human progress.⁷² Christ's progress necessarily implied, therefore, struggle.⁷³ The "congenital tendencies" in Christ's fallen humanity were, on this basis, crucial to our ethical progress and salvation.⁷⁴ Instead of the purification of Christ's flesh in an immaculate conception, Scott insisted that Christ's flesh was purified in His own constitution by the grace of the Spirit.⁷⁵

The theme of Christ's struggle is also important in Torrance's theological

struggle against man's flesh can sound provocative.

⁷²Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 101: "Conflict is essential to progress, and progress is essential to humanity." Scott is here obviously indebted to evolutionary thought.

⁷³Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 61: "This development was not conceived by Athanasius as the placid unhindered progress from perfection to perfection, but was effected in spite of, perhaps even by means of, the most strenuous resistance to temptations."

⁷⁴Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 96: "There is something in man, which, if not resisted becomes sin, though it is not sin if it be resisted. There are congenital tendencies in man which are as much part of his nature as his intellect or his will. It is not sinful to have such tendencies, but it is sinful when we do not fight against them. Should it be said that Christ had no such tendencies, then it must also be said that both human sin and human virtue were alike impossible to Him."

⁷⁵Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 49-50: "It will be noticed that nothing is said, either here or elsewhere, of the flesh having been sanctified for Christ by means of an immaculate conception, or by any other means, such as the reception of a pre-fallen nature of Adam. What is said is that the flesh was for the first time sanctified in Him, and that the grace of the Spirit was given Him for this purpose, that this sanctifying unction was bestowed upon Him 'on account of the flesh,' *i.e.*, in order that the flesh might be sanctified in His Person."

system.⁷⁶ Christ struggles with "the perverse nature of an alien creation" and overcomes.⁷⁷ An inward dimension to this struggle may also be discernible in Torrance's writings.⁷⁸ This theme may not be as singly developed in Torrance as in Scott, however, due to the multiplicity of other themes Torrance also includes concerning Christ's life.

Vicarious Humanity of Christ

Although Athanasius laid little stress upon the historical life of Jesus, Scott saw

⁷⁶Torrance, God and Rationality, 144: "Let it be stressed, however, that all this is achieved by the Word of God, not merely as in the original creation by direct fiat, but by condescending to participate in finite being, submitting to its limitations and operating within its struggles and structures, thus fulfilling God's saving purpose for the creation in and through the inner determination of His incarnate life as Man on earth and in history." Torrance, Theology in Reconstruction, 247: "And therefore he came not as isolated and naked Spirit, but as Spirit charged with all the experience of Jesus as he shared to the full our mortal nature and weakness, and endured its temptation and grief and suffering and death, with the experience of Jesus as he struggled and prayed, and worshipped and obeyed, and poured out his life in compassion for mankind. It is still in the Name of Jesus Christ that the Holy Spirit comes to us, and in no other name."

⁷⁷Torrance, God and Rationality, 143: "He came, therefore, to share our lost and enslaved existence where it was breaking up under the corruption of sin and guilt, disease and want, death and judgement, and to enter into the disordered state of our created rationalities in which finite distinctions are damaged and distorted into contradictions, in order to engage with the inhuman forces of darkness that had encroached upon the bodies and minds of men, to struggle with the perverse nature of an alienated creation, to meet the full hostility of evil by accepting and bearing it in himself, and to make an end of it in His own vicarious life and death."

⁷⁸Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 39: "Thus with the Incarnation the conflict between Israel and God would reach its most intense form, when Israel would suffer upheaval and the secrets of its existence would be laid bare. Intense and fearful as that state of affairs would be, it would be but the obverse of the reconciliation that God was bringing to its fulfillment. Hence throughout the earthly life of Jesus the fearful tension he embodied--how he was straitened until it was accomplished--and the reconciling love of God which he incarnated, advanced toward their climax in the crucifixion and resurrection of the Messiah"

that he placed great stress upon Christ's life as "one long process of development."⁷⁹

Since redemption is a process, Christ "advanced" our common humanity in each step of his life.⁸⁰ Christ's life, therefore, was "a continuous ethical process" in which sins were conquered and righteousness plundered every day.⁸¹ The cross was both the pinnacle of the mount and the tip of the iceberg of what Christ did for man's salvation.⁸² Christ purified our fallen humanity "by a life-long mortification,"

⁷⁹Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 77: "The fuller teaching of Athanasius suggests a far deeper view, a view which is ultimately derived from the Epistle to the Hebrews, namely, that the life of Christ was one long process of development. . . . This doctrine is all the more remarkable because Athanasius lays very little stress upon the life of the historical Jesus, and even 'made a sharp distinction between what the God and what the Man in Christ had done, in order to keep the Logos Homooousios free of everything human' [quoting Harnack]." One, however, wonders whether Scott's habit of Old Testament textual emendation might have prepared him for such a judgment! See footnote 13 above.

⁸⁰Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 81-2: "In Christ this process was begun, carried through, and completed. The flesh, that is to say, our common humanity, was advanced in Him through all its stages, passing from strength to strength, until at the Ascension it appeared in the presence of God, for the Ascension is the goal of the Incarnation."

⁸¹Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 62: "This conception necessarily implies that our Lord's saving work must be regarded as a continuous ethical process. The life of Christ was a life of redemption, or, as it is so frequently described in the Epistle to the Hebrews, a life of ever advancing perfection. At each stage in His life some new sin was condemned and some new righteousness attained."

⁸²Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 63: "This conflict against sin was consummated upon the Cross. It has been frequently overlooked that Athanasius in his treatment of the Crucifixion regards it more as a conflict than as suffering." Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 87: "Thus God received in Christ a perfect human obedience, which alone could satisfy both His love and His justice." It is noteworthy that Scott explicitly disallowed any concept of vicarious penitence on two grounds: "There can be no such thing as vicarious penitence, because penitence is only penitence when it is personal to the offender" (Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 119). Second, since Scott denied transference of guilt, he was forced to also deny transference of penitence (see Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 121). Scott may also distance himself from Erskine of Linlathen. See Scott, The Atonement, 11: "The

presenting our very nature to God.⁸³

Torrance, too, believes that Christ's whole life is ethical and meritorious on man's behalf and expresses his debt to the Eastern Fathers, most particularly to Athanasius.⁸⁴ Torrance tags this insight as "the vicarious humanity of Christ."⁸⁵ Torrance regrets that Athanasius' varied description of this truth is not appreciated by recent patristic scholars.⁸⁶ In his vicarious humanity, Christ fulfills all aspects of man's

opposition to be most feared by the current theory of the Atonement has always been that which came, not from without, but from within the Church; not from Atheism and Agnosticism, but from firm believers in the Divine Fatherhood; not from Huxley and Tyndal, but from Maurice and Erskine. If the latter had not all the truth upon their side, they had at least enough of truth to sanctify their protest. . . ." On the next page, Scott shows knowledge of P. T. Forsyth.

⁸³Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, x: "Christ, receiving our humanity in the condition in which we receive it, purified it by a life-long mortification, and in the end rendered it up to God without spot in the sacrifice of His Death. Thus human nature was atoned to God in the Person of Christ, and Christ offered, not something in the stead of man, but man himself."

⁸⁴Torrance, School of Faith, cviii-cix: "In His obedient human life Jesus Christ was not only the Son of God drawing near to us in the flesh, but in and out of our flesh He lived a life of perfect obedience and trust and confidence toward God the Father, a perfectly faithful life, in which His obedience and faith toward God were part of His vicarious and atoning life, part of His sanctified human nature."

⁸⁵Torrance, Theology in Reconciliation, 209: "The foregoing discussion and in particular the long examination of classical Greek theology should have made it very clear by now that the crucial point in all this is what we have called the *vicarious humanity* of Christ in which his mind, will and soul as a human agent are given their undiminished place in his saving work on behalf of mankind." Torrance, Theology in Reconciliation, 153: "While the Arians had pointed to the sanctification and even the self-sanctification of Christ as evidence for their views, Athanasius took them up at that point too with the same basic argument from the vicarious nature of the human life and work of Christ."

⁸⁶Torrance, Theology in Reconciliation, 228: "And Athanasius piled up the various Greek prepositions, to make clear the fulness and the depth of the *vicarious humanity* of Jesus Christ, and so to insist that in the Incarnation the Son of God *ministered not only of the things of God to man but ministered of the things of man to God*. That is to say, he understood the humanity of Jesus Christ as the humanity of him who is not

relationship to God.⁸⁷ Christ's faithfulness to God is man's only hope and only valid response to God.⁸⁸

Christ's Universal Humanity

What connection, therefore, exists between Christ's acts before God on man's behalf and the real experiences of men? Did Scott avoid external legal fictions, only to fall into internal ones? Not at all. He found the solution to this problem in Christ's humanity. Rejecting the doctrine of a *homo generalis*, Scott maintained Christ's

only Apostle from God but High Priest taken from among men, and the saving work of Christ in terms of his *human* as well as divine agency--it is the human priesthood and the saving mediatorship of Jesus Christ in and through his human kinship with us that Athanasius found so significant. That is certainly one of the major emphases of Athanasius in the *Contra Arianos*, as well as in other writings where he expounds the doctrine of the saving humanity of Christ in terms of his obedient life and self-sanctification on our behalf, and yet it is so often completely omitted by patristic scholars, as in the recent work of A. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*." For more on the connection Torrance sees between *Contra Arianos* and the vicarious humanity of Christ, see Torrance, *Trinitarian Faith*, 176; and Torrance, *Theology in Reconciliation*, 110.

⁸⁷Torrance, *God and Rationality*, 145: "In the Gospels we do not have to do simply with the Word of God and the response of man, but with the all-significant middle term, the divinely provided response in the vicarious humanity of Jesus Christ. On Christ's vicarious obedience, see Torrance, *God and Rationality*, 152-3. On Christ's vicarious questioning, see Torrance, *Theology in Reconstruction*, 122. On Christ's vicarious baptism, see Torrance, *Theology in Reconstruction*, 200. On Christ's vicarious worship, see Torrance, *Theology in Reconstruction*, 207; and Torrance, *Theology in Reconciliation*, 287. On Christ's vicarious faith, see Torrance, *Mediation of Christ*, 103. These are only a few aspects mentioned by Torrance.

⁸⁸Torrance, *God and Rationality*, 154: "If it was in His humanity in entire solidarity with us that Jesus Christ stood in our place, and gave to God an account for us in His life and death, in utter faithfulness to God and to man, then this includes the fact that He believed for us, offering to God in His vicarious faithfulness, the perfect response of human faith which we could not offer." Torrance, *God and Rationality*, 145: "Now that God's saving grace has taken this way, in the provision of man's true and faithful response in the vicarious humanity of Jesus Christ, it thereby invalidates all other ways of response."

concrete humanity.⁸⁹ However, he insisted "what took place in Christ was potential to the race."⁹⁰ This potentiality was on the one hand predicable of all men, and on the other hand available to all men via repetition.⁹¹ Any repetition is by "a vital force emanating from His exalted Humanity," not by the mere imitation of man.⁹² No wedge

⁸⁹Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 50: "It has been suggested that what Christ assumed was not the nature of an individual man, but the general concept of humanity. . . . [I]t appears to us that the Humanity ascribed to Christ by Athanasius is undoubtedly concrete. . . . Indeed it would seem to be impossible to predicate any real purification of a general concept; and the purification of humanity about to be described is undeniably real." In fact, Scott defines human nature in terms of Christ (see Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 92). Scott, Crux Crucis, 43: "He was more than a man. He was man, sharing the nature of the race. He was the representative man--the Son of Man. Here we are indeed in the presence of mystery. . . . Here is no outsider stepping in, but He who is one with man, and in whom all men are one. Here is identification in the highest sense of the term."

⁹⁰Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, x: "Thus human nature was atoned to God in the Person of Christ, and Christ offered, not something in the stead of man, but man himself. As yet the Atonement of humanity was restricted to the humanity assumed by Christ in His Incarnation, but what took place in Christ was potential to the race. . . . This implies a doctrine of repetition, what was done in Christ's being to be done in man by Christ." See also Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 80.

⁹¹Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 76: "This result was redemption, not as an abstract word, not even as a completed act, but as a perfected Person in Whom humanity was potentially perfected, and through Whom individual men might attain perfection, and even incorporation with the Divine." Scott was opposed to "substitution" as a principle both as a concept in Old Testament sacrifice and New Testament atonement. He was afraid that substitution would eliminate self-surrender and self-sacrifice on the part of believers, leading him to stress the theme of repetition. These concerns, if not the solutions to them, Scott has in common with Torrance. See Scott, Crux Crucis, 60-1.

⁹²Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 66: "What happened to Christ only happened to Him that it might afterwards be repeated in us. The successive steps by which humanity returned to God in the Person of Christ are to be reproduced in us, not so much by imitation on our part as by a vital force emanating from His exalted Humanity, which force alone can make imitation possible." Also see Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 47: "The two perfections, Christ's and ours, are not mystically confused, but the first is regarded as the productive cause of the second."

should, therefore, be driven between the work by Christ in His Person and His work in man, because man participates in Christ's very redeemed humanity.⁹³

Torrance also sees an intimate connection between Christ and all men universally through his humanity in the writings of Athanasius.⁹⁴ However, his favorite expression for this phenomenon is "ontological relation" or "onto-relation."⁹⁵

Anhypostasia and Enhypostasia

While not fleshed out in a systematic form, Scott did notice two themes in Athanasius which must be held in tension: atonement as "an internal process" and

⁹³Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 138: "The external transaction and the removal of sin belong to different orders; the removal of sin from human nature as assumed by Christ, a removal consummated by a death unto sin, and the removal of sin in us by participation in the Humanity of Christ, are, on the contrary, facts of the same order, and are related as effect is related to cause, indeed the salvation of man is the extension of the salvation of humanity once for all attained in Christ." While there are two stages in man's redemption--one in Christ, the other in man--they are both united at the point of Christ's person and humanity. Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 90: "Identity of process demands identity of person." Scott also points to a vague sacramentalism as a means of participation, which might not be incompatible with Torrance's own relational view. See Scott, The Atonement, 318.

⁹⁴Torrance, Trinitarian Faith, 182: "While Athanasius did not speak specifically of the infinite value of Christ's sacrifice, he did insist on the universal range of the vicarious work of Christ in incarnation and redemption, which was due to the fact that it was not just a man who suffered and died for us but the Lord as man, not just the life of a man that was offered to save us but the life of God as man. As we have seen, he never tired of asserting that what Christ accomplished on our behalf and in our place . . . applied to *all* without any qualification. In spite of this, there is no suggestion in the thought of Athanasius of the kind of 'universalism' advocated by Origen or by Gregory Nyssen."

⁹⁵Torrance, Trinitarian Faith, 182: "In the profound interaction between incarnation and atonement in Jesus, the blessed exchange it involved between the divine-human life of Jesus and mankind has the effect of finalising and sealing the ontological relations between every man and Jesus Christ."

atonement as "a personal transaction."⁹⁶ The former, however, must always be primary to the latter.⁹⁷ Two important themes in unresolved juxtaposition are also present in Torrance's theology, but more dogmatically formulated under the doctrines of anhypostasia and enhypostasia.⁹⁸

The Latin Heresy

The most interesting historical parallel between Scott and Torrance is what Torrance designates "the Latin Heresy."⁹⁹ The great error of Latin theology, to Torrance's mind, was the use of external instead of internal categories for theological thought and the loss of Athanasius' teaching of Christ's *fallen* humanity involved with it. Serious epistemological and soteriological dualisms subsequently flowed from this

⁹⁶Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 82: "Between the Atonement view as merely external transaction, and the view which regards it as an internal process, there is an intermediate view, which regards it as what, in default of a better term, we have ventured to term a personal transaction. The tendency of our author is always in the direction of the internal view, but he never goes so far as to adopt this view to the exclusion of the transactional element, which we believe to be essential to the doctrine of forgiveness."

⁹⁷Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 87: "The transactional element must, however, always be regarded as of secondary importance"

⁹⁸The fundamental importance for these two dogmatic formulations of Torrance's theology has been shown in Chapter 1 of this dissertation. For examples of Torrance's various applications of anhypostasia and enhypostasia, see Torrance, Conflict and Agreement, vol. 1, 245; Torrance, Theology in Reconstruction, 131, 149; and Torrance, Space, Time, and Resurrection, 51, 55, 95. Torrance details this distinction and its implications especially in his unpublished New College Lectures (see "Outline of the Doctrine of Christ" and "Reformed Doctrine of Christ"). Trook has also noticed this important dogmatic concept in Torrance's theology, calling it "the *atomic substructure* of his thought" (Trook, 86).

⁹⁹For the extended version of an article previously published with the same title, see T. F. Torrance, "Karl Barth and the Latin Heresy," chap. 8 in Karl Barth: Biblical and Evangelical Theologian, 213-240.

flaw.¹⁰⁰

Scott, too, identified the Latin Heresy--although without Torrance's formal title--as the great failing of the Western church, leading it to an erroneous conception of Christ's work and the doctrine of the atonement.¹⁰¹ In fact, this mistake was so pernicious to proper theological development, that Scott dismissed all serious dogmatic formulation from the commission of the Latin Heresy until his own modern time, calling it "an interlude, a parenthesis of theology."¹⁰² While lacking in Torrance's further development of the epistemological implications that are said to be a part of it, the Anglican anticipated the soteriological dimension of Torrance's Latin Heresy in the

¹⁰⁰Torrance, The Christian Frame of Mind, 9-10: "This western divergence from the Eastern Church . . . held instead that it was not our fallen Adamic nature but some neutral human nature in Christ that became the instrument for his saving work for mankind. The theological consequences of that position were immense, as we can see in the typical approach of Latin theology to the idea of original sin as in the teaching of St Augustine, in its formulation of a doctrine of atonement largely in terms of external juridical relations, and of course in the Roman dogmas of 'the immaculate conception' and the 'assumption of Mary', which remain a real barrier between the Eastern and Western Church. Apart from these specific doctrines, however, failure to recognise that the human mind, far from being neutral, is actually estranged and twisted, and thus in need of internal healing, opened the door to a pre-Christian Greek rationalism that has affected not only western theology but all western culture and science." See also Torrance, Karl Barth: Biblical and Evangelical Theologian, 215-6, 231-2.

¹⁰¹Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 89: "The Athanasian arch was robbed of its cornerstone by the assertion that the nature assumed by Christ was the nature of Adam prior to his Fall, and thus was a nature which needed not to be redeemed in Christ. There could be no doctrine of internal process, when there was perfection at the outset." See also Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, xi, 121.

¹⁰²Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, xi: "It is an interlude, a parenthesis of theology, an attempt to open a door when the key has been lost." Scott credited the rediscovery of this ancient truth to no other. Presumably, he thought himself the one who had located the key for the modern Church once again, publishing it to the world in the present work in question.

very year the Scot was born in China!¹⁰³

One difference between Scott and Torrance on the Latin Heresy, however, is the original culprit identified as responsible for the tragic shift. Scott pointed to Augustine as the chargeable cause of the church's troubles.¹⁰⁴ The Anglican's censure of Augustine was softened, however, when he explained that "the supposed authority of the two treatises against Apollinarius, which Augustine may well have perused," probably prejudiced his judgement.¹⁰⁵ If Augustine transmitted the Latin Heresy into the mainstream thinking of the church, at least he did so, Scott concluded, under "the supposed authority of S. Athanasius!"¹⁰⁶

¹⁰³Torrance was born on 30 August 1913. While Scott published in 1914, he presumably wrote at least the year before.

¹⁰⁴Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, xi: "Its life-blood had been drained away by the speculations of Augustine. It fell out of touch with life and reality when the Church began to teach that Christ received an ideal humanity, not the humanity of actual men with its liability to temptation and its need for conflict." Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 121: Augustine was led by "the exigency of the Pelagian controversy . . . to modify the meaning of texts which the Greek Fathers had expounded literally." Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 122: Augustine's doctrine of original sin "made it impossible for him to follow the doctrine of Athanasius."

¹⁰⁵Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 89, 122. Scott in an Appendix to his work accepts that Athanasian authorship of the two volumes of Contra Apollinarius is scarcely probable: "These remarkable treatises, ostensibly written to confute Apollinarius, show unmistakable traces of Apollinarian influence . . ." (Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 143). Torrance, however, insists on Athanasian authorship of these volumes (see T. F. Torrance, Introduction to Dragas, Athanasius Contra Apollinarem, 1-2). Both Scott and Torrance cite and appear to accept the authenticity of Orationes Contra Arianos III and IV, which has now been disputed by Charles Kannengiesser. Compare Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 31, 55; Torrance, Trinitarian Faith, 155, 161; C. Kannengiesser, "Athanasius' So-Called Third Oration Against the Arians," unpublished manuscript; and C. Kannengiesser, "Athanasius of Alexandria *Three Orations Against the Arians*: A Reappraisal," in Studia Patristica, vol. 17, pt. 3 (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1982), 981-95.

¹⁰⁶Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 90.

Torrance, however, places the blame originally on the shoulders of two other figures: Tertullian and Leo the Great.¹⁰⁷ Tertullian was responsible for the church's conceptual problems.¹⁰⁸ It was Leo, however, who was responsible for the loss of Christ's fallen humanity in the Western church.¹⁰⁹ Before Leo's error the church's mind was one.¹¹⁰ After Leo's error, however, the scene was progressively changed.¹¹¹ Torrance does specifically blame Augustine for teaching the soteriological form of the Latin Heresy, crediting him with popularizing especially

¹⁰⁷Torrance, Theology in Reconciliation, 230: "In the Western Church, owing partly to the reintroduction of dualism into theology through St Augustine, and partly to the anthropocentric and forensic cast of mind deriving from Tertullian, the doctrine of redemption tends to be expounded in terms of external relations between Christ and sinful people, and so the judicial element assumes a role of predominant significance."

¹⁰⁸Torrance, Karl Barth: Biblical and Evangelical Theologian, 221: He "operated with an Arian-like dualist mode of thought which led him to think of the Word of God, not as eternally generated in him, but as an emanation from His Mind" This in turn was adopted by Thomas Aquinas, who wed the approach to Aristotelian abstraction, producing what Torrance calls "Augustinian and Thomist Dualism." See Torrance, Karl Barth: Biblical and Evangelical Theologian, 223.

¹⁰⁹Torrance, The Christian Frame of Mind, 9-10: "It is unfortunate, and very astonishing, that Latin theology never really appreciated the profound implications of the Greek Patristic principle that 'the unassumed is the unhealed'. This western divergence from the Eastern Church can be traced back to Leo the Great's hesitation to accept the fact that in the Incarnation the God of God took our depraved human nature upon himself, while redeeming, healing and sanctifying it in himself. He held instead that it was not our fallen Adamic nature but some neutral human nature in Christ that became the instrument for his saving work for mankind."

¹¹⁰Torrance, Karl Barth: Biblical and Evangelical Theologian, 231: "From Irenaeus to Cyril of Alexandria the Church had everywhere taught that in becoming one with us and one of us in Jesus Christ, God had humbled himself to take our lost cause upon himself by assuming our fallen human nature, our humanity diseased in mind and soul, our actual human existence enslaved to sin and subjected to judgment and death"

¹¹¹Torrance, Karl Barth: Biblical and Evangelical Theologian, 231-2: "From the fifth century onwards, however, there developed in Latin theology, an increasing rejection of this teaching for another, according to which it was not our fallen humanity that Jesus took from the Virgin Mary, but humanity in its perfect original state."

its epistemological form, which in turn undermined "the wholeness of the doctrine of atoning reconciliation."¹¹²

Synopsis of Parallels

Twelve major parallels between Scott and Torrance have been noted in some detail.¹¹³ Although not alike in every technicality, there is a striking similarity in theme and concern between the two men. They substantially agree on the diagnosis and cure for the modern church's theological ailment, which is to be found by looking back and looking East.¹¹⁴ Scott's own comments concerning the extensive parallels that he saw

¹¹²Torrance, The Christian Frame of Mind, 9-10: "He held instead that it was not our fallen Adamic nature but some neutral human nature in Christ that became the instrument for his saving work for mankind. The theological consequences of that position were immense, as we can see in the typical approach of Latin theology to the idea of original sin as in the teaching of St Augustine, in its formulation of a doctrine of atonement largely in terms of external juridical relations, and of course in the Roman dogmas of 'the immaculate conception' and the 'assumption of Mary', which remain a real barrier between the Eastern and Western Church." Torrance, Karl Barth: Biblical and Evangelical Theologian, 222, 233.

¹¹³Other more minor parallels have not been noted. For example, the two authors share a conspicuous interest in relating the modern science of their day to theology (see Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 71, 114-7, 133; and Torrance, Theological Science [London: Oxford University Press, 1969], 116-31). Also, epistemological concerns are at some points similar between the two (compare Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 13; and T. F. Torrance, Reality and Evangelical Theology [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982], 144). Finally, the two share an aversion to traditional Calvinism (see Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 73). On Torrance, Kruger rightly observes, "Underneath all of Torrance's theology stands the hidden heartbeat of his opposition to the limiting factor in traditional Calvinism." See Kruger, 333.

¹¹⁴Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, ix: "We would endeavor to show very briefly that it is the difficulties here referred to which put this doctrine out of touch with reality and life, and that these difficulties are not really inherent, but are in fact excrescences due to the mistaken interpretation of this doctrine by Latin theology." Torrance, Christian Frame of Mind, 10: "It is at this very point that the transformation of the Greek mind through Greek Patristic theology has so much to offer us today . . .

between Irenaeus and Athanasius may well apply--albeit in a more limited way--to his own relationship to Torrance:

Such a conspicuous agreement between writers so widely separate in place and in time presents a remarkable phenomenon.¹¹⁵

Obviously, the "conspicuous agreement" between Scott and Torrance may be little more than a testimony to the great power and clarity of Athanasius, with whom they both were acutely concerned. But could there be a closer connection between Scott and Torrance? How could such a connection ever be verified or documented?

The New College Connection

Although not held in the National Library of Scotland or the British Library, Scott's Athanasius on the Atonement is in the New College Library in Edinburgh.¹¹⁶ This copy was donated by Principal Alexander Whyte--who himself had no small interest in Athanasius--probably before 1919.¹¹⁷

Borrowing ledgers for the New College Library recently re-discovered in the New College Archives reveal that T. F. Torrance shared Alexander Whyte's interest in

"

¹¹⁵Scott, Athanasius on the Atonement, 108-9.

¹¹⁶See footnote 8 above. Scott used a printing house in his local parish for this work. Perhaps the obscurity of the publisher--J. & C. Mort, Ltd., 39 Greengate Street, Stafford--may explain why it is not held in the Scottish and British National Libraries.

¹¹⁷Whyte's nameplate dedication appears inside the front cover of the book. His principalship ended in 1916, but many of his books were donated to New College in 1918. G. F. Barbour, The Life of Alexander Whyte, D.D. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1924), 108, 175, 489, 599.

Athanasius during his student days.¹¹⁸ Library inventories have earned an honoured place as important modern research tools:

From Hottinger to the modern user of the British Museum catalogue, scholars have always found library catalogues an indispensable research tool. Such catalogues are especially useful, for example, in the study of individual writers.¹¹⁹

Obviously, a cautious appraisal of the data contained in such library listings must be exercised. Even private libraries' catalogues are subject to misinterpretation:

... the limitations of such a list must not be minimized or neglected. The mere fact that a book appears in a library does not mean the owner has read the book, or even that he is aware of its contents.¹²⁰

Catalogues of books borrowed from a lending library, however, hold even more promise for academic research than mere holdings catalogues.¹²¹ When dealing

¹¹⁸These ledger books--numbered AA 2.1.95 through AA 2.1.97 in the New College Archives collection--contain a record of all books borrowed and returned from the New College Library until ca. 1965. They were only recently re-discovered by the New College Library staff after questions were raised during this investigation. There are some gaps in the record prior to 1900 and after 1950 due to missing ledger books. See Appendix 2.

¹¹⁹Sears Jayne, Library Catalogues of the English Renaissance (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1956), 49. For an excellent example of a modern publication of such library listings, see E. S. Leedham-Green, Books in Cambridge Inventories: Book-Lists from Vice-Chancellor's Court Probate Inventories in the Tudor and Stuart Periods, vols. 1 and 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), which gives lists by owner and author.

¹²⁰G. S. Rousseau, "Science Books and Their Readers in the Eighteenth Century," in Books and Their Readers in Eighteenth-Century England, ed. I. Rivers (Leicester and New York: Leicester University Press and St. Martin's Press, 1982), 237.

¹²¹Unfortunately, a suitable modern library science guide to the accurate interpretation of library borrowing catalogues has not yet been located by this author. Most works in the field cover the interpretation of library listing catalogues, not borrowing catalogues, which is different altogether. *Prima facie*, borrowing catalogues are potentially more informative than lists of library holdings.

with library borrowing records, the researcher can be reasonably confident that a book was taken on a specific occasion with an intent to read it.¹²² The absence of a book in a ledger does not necessarily mean that the book in question was never read, as other possible sources of printed materials must be kept in mind during the evaluation of library lending records.¹²³ However, patterns of actual borrowings can give an indication as to whether other outlets were required or used frequently.¹²⁴

On 16 December 1935, Torrance borrowed one of Archibald Robertson's editions of Athanasius' De Incarnatione for some unspecified length of time.¹²⁵ Over a

¹²²The specific length of time a work is borrowed may be deceptive. Experience shows this author that the longer the book is held, the less chance that the work will actually be perused! The best result may be when a series of books on one subject are checked out for a month or less, indicating a serious intent to study the matter.

¹²³In Torrance's case there were several other possible outlets for books: his own personal library, his father's personal library, his brothers' personal libraries, the University of Edinburgh Library, the National Library of Scotland, the Edinburgh Central Library, and professors' personal libraries, to name only a few. Unfortunately, the University of Edinburgh Library, the National Library of Scotland, and the Edinburgh Central Library do not have borrowing records for this period.

¹²⁴It is noteworthy, for example, that Torrance's Calvin's Doctrine of Man (London: Lutterworth Press, 1949) did not require extensive borrowing from sources other than the New College Library, at least as reflected in the footnotes. Thus, in at least one test case, Torrance appears to have relied almost exclusively on the resources of the New College Library. While obviously not statistically significant, this fact does point out an important question: in his early years was Torrance extensively drawing on other theological collections?

¹²⁵Library Lending Ledger, call number AA 2.1.96, New College Archives, Edinburgh, 92. The entry reads "Robertson: Athanasius D. Incarnatione." The return entry lists the day of the month as 16 but does not specify the month. Torrance could well have returned the work on the same day, prompting the librarian to leave the month blank, or perhaps he returned the volume a month later on January 16, when he also returned some other volumes. Three of Robertson's Greek editions of Athanasius' De Incarnatione--1882, 1883, and 1901--are in the New College collection, as is his 1911 English translation. The 1882 edition is now in tatters from years of use, missing several pages. It is unclear which edition Torrance borrowed. The original Greek

year later on 19 January 1937 both the second volume of John Henry Cardinal Newman's Select Treatises of St. Athanasius in Controversy with the Arians and an unspecified Greek text of De Incarnatione, probably Robertson's, were checked out by Torrance.¹²⁶ Only three days later, on 22 January 1937, the young Thomas Forsyth Torrance borrowed from the New College Library Melville Scott's Athanasius on the

edition is St. Athanasius on the Incarnation, ed. Archibald Robertson with intro. and notes (London: D. Nutt, 1882). The 1901 Greek edition is St. Athanasius on the Incarnation, 3rd ed., ed. Archibald Robertson, with intro. and notes (London: D. Nutt, 1901).

¹²⁶Library Lending Ledger, call number AA 2.1.96, New College Archives, Edinburgh, 92. The entries read "Newman: Athanasius II" and "Athanasius: De Incarnatione" (see J. H. Newman, Selected Treatises of St. Athanasius in Controversy with the Arians, vol. 2, 2nd ed. [London: Pickering & Co., 1881]). Newman's second volume is an appendix to his first volume of English translations of selected Athanasian works. Over 100 key terms, topics, and names are examined by Newman in the second volume, with extensive quotations from a variety of Early Church sources. Newman's work might well have influenced Torrance's thought.

Atonement.¹²⁷ All three works were returned at an unspecified date.¹²⁸ No other works by or on Athanasius were checked out of the New College Library by Torrance during his student years.¹²⁹ Thus, Melville Scott's Athanasius on the Atonement was one of two secondary works on St. Athanasius of Alexandria that divinity student T. F. Torrance ever borrowed from the New College Library.

Scott's Degree of Influence

What conclusions, therefore, can be drawn from the evidence amassed above?

¹²⁷Library Lending Ledger, call number AA 2.1.96, New College Archives, Edinburgh, 92. This entry is one of the few which does not list an author, stating simply "Athanasius on the Atonement." Torrance must, however, have checked out Melville Scott's Athanasius on the Atonement, since it was the only work by that title in the collection at the New College Library. No such work by Athanasius exists (see M. Geerard, Clavis Patrum Graecorum, vol. 2 [Turnhout: Brepols, 1974], 12-60). "Scott" should have appeared before the title, the two separated by a colon. Either Torrance himself failed to copy the author's name onto the daily check-out sheets, or the librarian failed to copy the author's name into the main ledger. The first possibility is quite probable, since it is impossible from looking at the book's title card in the New College card catalogue to determine whether the work was written by Athanasius and merely edited by Melville Scott or whether it was written by Melville Scott on Athanasius' teachings. Also, Athanasius was probably assumed to be the author by the librarian, since the first letter in the word "on" is written twice on top of itself in the ledger book, both in upper and lower case. Thus, it is most likely that Torrance himself failed to list the proper author. Perhaps he thought the work was by Athanasius, only later discovering that it was not.

¹²⁸Library Lending Ledger, call number AA 2.1.96., New College Archives, Edinburgh, 92. Once again, the borrowing register lists only the day on which the first two books were returned, given as "29." Scott's work was also returned on the 29th, but the month entry, while filled in, is almost illegible. Most likely it says "Jan," meaning January, but it is impossible to be absolutely sure. Since books were returned at various intervals, the precise length of time Torrance retained the volumes is impossible to determine. Most likely, however, Torrance was exposed to Melville Scott's Athanasius on the Atonement for at least a week while he appears to have been studying the Church Father's writings.

¹²⁹Library Lending Ledgers, call numbers AA.2.1.96 and AA.2.1.97, New College Archives, Edinburgh.

Can complete dependence by Torrance on Scott be posited for his entire theological agenda? In other words, is Melville Scott's Athanasius on the Atonement a "secret source" behind the Christocentric soteriology of T. F. Torrance?

Without a doubt, this is the one conclusion we may not draw from the data. The fact that Torrance only checked Scott out of the New College Library once in January 1937 proves that it was not an abiding influence on his thinking. If it had been so, then on repeated occasions the obscure work would have been borrowed by Torrance, and possibly also by his friends and family on his recommendation.¹³⁰ Torrance has not just lifted his treatment of Athanasius or the bulk of his theology from Scott. Such a conspiracy theory is ruled out of court by the same evidence that proves Torrance ever examined the work--the New College Library Borrowing Ledgers.

How much of Athanasius on the Atonement did the young T. F. Torrance actually read? On 22 January 1937, T. F. Torrance appears to have been studying the writings of Athanasius of Alexandria with particular intensity.¹³¹ For three days he held two volumes: Athanasius' De Incarnatione and Newman's theological wordbook to

¹³⁰For example, there is no record that his brother J. B. Torrance ever checked out Scott during his student days at New College. Library Lending Ledgers, call numbers AA 2.1.95 to AA 2.1.97, New College Archives, Edinburgh. A thorough check of the Borrowing Ledgers has not yet been completed with regard to Torrance's classmates. If Scott's volume appears frequently as a borrowed item, then it could have also been on a class reading list. Also, the only copy of Athanasius on the Atonement in Torrance's library today is a xerox of the New College volume, obviously not made until after the advent of such technology.

¹³¹About this period Torrance recounts: "The early Church and the Greek Fathers, Athanasius in particular, had always fascinated me" Torrance, Karl Barth: Biblical and Evangelical Theologian, 122.

Early Church teaching. Then he chose to borrow a secondary work explaining Athanasius' theology in more detail. While it cannot be stated with absolute certainty that he ever got past the title page, it does on the face of it seem absurd to think that he did not at least read the little four-page preface.¹³² There Melville Scott laid out the heart of his theological agenda--not only his conclusions about Athanasius' teaching, but also the very core of his own theological and religious concerns.¹³³ At *that* point would Thomas Forsyth Torrance have put the volume aside?

Whatever Torrance did quietly carry away from Athanasius on the Atonement might best be explained by Torrance's own epistemological reflections on the irreversibility of knowledge:

Once we have got hold of the basic clue or gained some anticipatory insight into the pattern of things, we set about re-examining and reinterpreting all the data, putting them together under the guidance of the basic insight we have discovered until the full coherent pattern comes clearly into view. Now of course in a scientific inquiry the fundamental insight with which we work may have to be revised as all the pieces of evidence come together and throw light upon each other, but nevertheless it is under the direction of that insight that the discovery is made. Once the insight has put us on the track of that discovery, something irreversible has taken place in our understanding: a pattern of truth has been built into our minds on which we cannot go back, and

¹³²Due to the page layout, the preface is spread on four pages. However, in the Expository Times it covered only one page and four lines. Its brevity and density cannot be overstated.

¹³³At least eleven major parallels with Torrance are easily noticed in the preface: the fallen humanity of Christ, man's internal instead of external relation with Christ, the universality of Christ's person for all men, the life-long work of Christ in his person, the unassumed is the unhealed, the failure of Latin theology, the purity of early Eastern theology, the Latin Heresy, and an intense interest in Irenaeus, Athanasius, and Gregory Nazianzen. While all of these are obviously interrelated in both Scott's and Torrance's systems, as isolated themes they can and do occur in other various theologies, giving real weight to their occurrence when comparing Scott and Torrance.

which we cannot rationally deny.¹³⁴

Ideas, like facts, are stubborn things: they cannot be gone back on or rationally be denied. They inevitably shape the rest of our thinking, particularly in such a specialized area as Patristics studies.

What impact, then, did Melville Scott's Athanasius on the Atonement have on the young Torrance? As with first loves, the first works a bright, young divinity student reads on a subject of great interest can quietly and subtly remain with him. In Torrance's case, the influence seems to have been quite unconscious.¹³⁵ It was more Scott's thought that impacted Torrance's thinking than his person.

The nagging silence of Torrance's own writings on Melville Scott does tend to dispell one extreme possibility. If the important ideas contained in Athanasius on the Atonement were for the young Torrance confirmation of his own previous understanding of both Athanasius and the solution to the problems of Latin theology, then Scott would probably have been eagerly cited as confirmation of this brilliant dogmatic insight, just as Kruger and Hart have done.¹³⁶ Scott's Athanasius on the Atonement appears, therefore, to be more a contribution to Torrance's developing

¹³⁴Torrance, Mediation of Christ, 14. For an example of Torrance's use of conceptual irreversibility, see Torrance, Trinitarian Faith, 144.

¹³⁵See footnote 25. Torrance does not remember ever borrowing Athanasius on the Atonement, which was not surprising and obviously no fault at 78 years of age, entirely lucid though one may be.

¹³⁶This is precisely what originally prompted this study. See footnotes 1 and 6. Whether Scott's work--when brought to his attention by George Dragas in the late 1960's--was influential in Torrance's development of the non-assumptus or interest in a particular school of Athanasian interpretation, we may, however, never know.

thought than a confirmation of his own previous insights.¹³⁷

Torrance did not borrow Scott's book again in all his days as a student at New College.¹³⁸ But that is not so incredible--Torrance graduated and left for the Continent only a few months after the experience. There he came under the influence of the one he considers to have been both the modern-day Athanasius and a theological Einstein--Professor Karl Barth.¹³⁹

In Basel, Torrance would have found one of Scott's central tenets--Christ's fallen humanity--more than compatible with the teaching of his mentor. Scott's Christ had "congenital tendencies," while Barth's had "vitiating flesh."¹⁴⁰ It is not surprising, therefore, that the obscure Anglican Old Testament scholar was soon eclipsed by the Swiss Prince of the Church.

¹³⁷Since Torrance's attention was again drawn to Scott's work in the late 1960's or early 1970's by George Dragas, is it possible that Scott contributed to Torrance's developing Christology not once but twice? The rise of the non-assumptus as a prominent theme in Torrance's theological presentation dates from this later period.

¹³⁸Library Lending Ledgers, call numbers AA 2.1.96 and AA 2.1.97, New College Archives, Edinburgh.

¹³⁹Torrance, Karl Barth: Biblical and Evangelical Theologian, xi-xii.

¹⁴⁰Scott, x; Karl Barth, Church Dogmatics I.2, 151-71, especially 158-9. Also see Barth's "sin-controlled flesh" of Christ in Karl Barth, The Epistle to the Romans, trans. from 6th ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933), 279. This is not to say that Scott and Barth were aware of each other. Barth does not mention Scott in the Church Dogmatics, and there is no reason to think he would have been aware of such an obscure Anglican figure. Scott never refers to Barth in his works, as far as this author knows. J. H. Newman also teaches the fallen human nature of Christ in the work Torrance returned at the same time he returned Scott's (Newman, 120). However, Newman's view is imbedded in an overriding sacramentalism foreign to both Scott and Torrance. A more complete study of Newman's work and its impact on Torrance is needed.

Conclusions

Torrance's interaction with Melville Scott's Athanasius on the Atonement has been suggested and his exposure to the work proven. Recently re-discovered borrowing records confirm that the obscure book, written by an Anglican Old Testament scholar, was checked out of the New College Library by T. F. Torrance during the final year of his Bachelor of Divinity studies in Edinburgh. The parallels between the thought of Torrance and Scott are quite striking, but Torrance's debt to Scott is probably more conceptual than personal. Melville Scott's key insights into Patristics studies appear to have colored Torrance's reading of Athanasius, as well as contributed to his Christocentric soteriology. More particularly, Torrance's interrelation of the incarnation and the atonement are anticipated by Scott at several crucial points, especially the doctrine of Christ's fallen humanity and the Latin Heresy.